

***MORAL EMOTIONS IN ADOLESCENT GIRLS' RELATIONAL AGGRESSION***

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Jessica Marie Matthews

May 2014

© 2014 Jessica Marie Matthews

# MORAL EMOTIONS IN ADOLESCENT GIRLS' RELATIONAL AGGRESSION

Jessica Marie Matthews, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2014

A longitudinal analysis of intensive interviews with 11 to 15 fifth to eighth grade girls' moral emotions in relational aggression situations was conducted and examined in relation to actions taken. Results demonstrate which moral and non-moral emotions these girls reported in real and hypothetical situations and how constellations of use of emotions change over time. Using Haidt's moral emotion families and a constructed grounded theory approach, twenty-eight total emotions were identified as used by all participants across all four years of the study, including several sub-types of anger and guilt. Close examination of moral emotions demonstrated that girls report using a variety of emotion families to think through responses to relational aggression, although connections between specific emotions and specific actions were not found. Perspective taking was the most common action reported, and most participants evidenced a desire to limit interpersonal hurt while maintaining friendships. Emotional awareness strategies were identified and were used by girls to respond to and regulate their own and others' emotions. As participants moved from fifth to eighth grade, they focused less on compassion for victims and more on avoiding anger and conflict. Although the sample size is small and middle class, the results suggest that moral emotions and emotional awareness play important roles in how girls judge and act when discussing their experiences with relational aggression. Results of this

study contribute to theories regarding the interplay between moral emotions and moral judgment. Implications for future research and for interventions are proposed.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Jessica Marie Matthews graduated from Harvard University in 2004 with an A.B. in the Comparative Study of Religion and Women's Studies. After teaching for a year in Cambridge, Massachusetts, she matriculated at Cornell University in the Department of Education. She earned her M.S. in 2009 in Education. She worked at Cornell in Washington as a tutor and at Stanford University as Associate Dean and Director of Summer Session. She earned her Ph.D. in Education in May 2014.

To Mr. Bosworth, who always told me that I could, and to my students, who always provided perspective and compassion.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Dawn Schrader, for her years of advice, support, and mentorship. She has seen me through academic and personal struggles, and I would not be who I am or where I am today without her. I deeply appreciate her time and wisdom as I have worked through this project, which would not exist without her. My committee members Dr. John Eckenrode and Dr. Cindy Hazan have provided thoughtful critique and support throughout my time at Cornell. I would also like to thank the many undergraduate research assistants who assisted with data collection and analysis. While there are too many to list, I thank them for their assistance, and I hope that they learned as much as I did in this process.

Dr. Betty Heath-Camp was a wonderful teacher and mentor to me, and her thoughtful guidance supported me throughout my graduate career.

Dr. Arthur Wilson mentored me as I taught my first solo undergraduate course, and I appreciate both the opportunity he gave me and the conversations about education in our meetings.

Nancy Marino and her classes of first-grade students at Cayuga Heights and South Hill elementary schools allowed me to become a part of their classes and connected me to the classroom.

Bill Holinger, Dr. Rita Pandey, and the rest of the staff of Harvard Summer School have been my home away from home. Working at Harvard Summer opened many new doors for me, while providing me with a large group of people who supported me in my work.

The staff and students of the Cornell-in-Washington program provided me with a home and a community during my most intensive writing time.

My parents have always loved and supported me, for which I am grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter One: Introduction to the Study</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Chapter Two: Literature Review</b>	<b>15</b>
Defining Emotions	16
Moral Motivation for Action and the Relationship to Emotion	21
Non-Moral Considerations: Social Information Processing	37
Moral Emotions and Emotion Families	38
Moral Emotions, Action, and Relational Aggression	53
Summary of the Literature	56
<b>Chapter Three: Methods</b>	<b>58</b>
Assumptions	58
Research Questions	60
Data Sources and Participants	62
Interviews	64
Coding Procedure: Approach and Methodological Grounding	67
Summary of the Methods	76
<b>Chapter Four: Results</b>	<b>77</b>
Question One: Expression of Moral Emotions	78
Question Two: Emotion Changes Over Time	90
Question Three: Emotional Awareness and Recognition	110
Question Four: Emotions' Effect on Action	120
Question Five: Motivations and Actions	128
Summary of Overall Findings	134
<b>Chapter Five: Discussion and Conclusions</b>	<b>136</b>
Expression of Emotion	137
Emotional Constellations	139



Co-occurrences of Emotions, Awareness, Motivations, and Actions	140
Theoretical Implications	143
Practical Implications	147
Suggestions for Further Research	148
<b>References</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>169</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Secondary Emotional Concepts (Russell, 2003)	18
Table 2: Emotion Codes	78
Table 3: Participant Use of Emotion Code by Grade (in percent)	85
Table 4: Emotional Constellations Participants 2 through 7	92
Table 5: Emotional Constellations Participants 8 through 13	93
Table 6: Emotional Constellations Participants 14 through 16	94
Table 7: Fifth Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness	113
Table 8: Sixth Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness	114
Table 9: Seventh Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness	115
Table 10: Eighth Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness	116
Table 11: Fifth Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action	121
Table 12: Sixth Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action	122
Table 13: Seventh Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action	123
Table 14: Eighth Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action	124
Table 15: Fifth Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action	129
Table 16: Sixth Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action	129
Table 17: Seventh Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action	130
Table 18: Eighth Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action	130

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY**

In 2013, Retaeh Parsons died after being intensely bullied by her classmates. Having gone to a party when she was 15, Retaeh alleged that she had been sexually assaulted by older boys. Several explicit photos were taken of Retaeh that night, and they were circulated around her school. Despite switching schools, harassment continued, and Retaeh tragically took her own life. Although her case may seem extreme, many adolescent girls face the same harassment as Retaeh did, and this aggression has only escalated with the proliferation of social media, becoming even more common and more destructive to the lives of the victims.

Similar scenarios are unfortunately becoming a too common in the news. Long dismissed as “typical girl behavior,” we now know that relational aggression can have serious consequences for those victimized. Recent cases of suicide, suicidal ideation, self-harm, depression, and distress show the toll that relational aggression has on the victims, and questions remain on how it might affect the personal and social lives of bystanders and aggressors. What is remarkable about these stories is the emotional toll that is taken on the victims in the aftermath of the aggression. Bullies understand this, and use this emotional assault skillfully and purposefully to exact their control over others.

Studying relational aggression is complicated due to the covert nature of the behavior. Girls are adept at hiding the behavior from adults, and many behaviors can such as whispering, accidental tripping, or even social media posts are hidden within the adolescent culture. Moreover, many adults dismiss the behavior or normalize it,

telling victims to ignore their tormentors, and girls themselves do not want adults to interfere in fear of “making things worse.” Further complicating research is the question of how maladaptive relational aggression is, and how to define overly harmful instances of it. The study on which this dissertation is based, Schrader’s Girls Relational Aggression Longitudinal Study (GRLS, 2005-current) was conceptualized to understand the covert nature of relational aggression by asking girls in private interviews to reflect on their own behaviors and the behavior of their friends. By interviewing girls separate from the context of their peers and asking them to reflect on situations of relational aggression that they have experienced, they have the opportunity to reflect on and discuss their actions and emotional reactions to their relational aggression experiences. Schrader’s study conceptualizes relational aggression as a moral problem, and the data reported on here examined moral thoughts and emotions girls experienced as they moved from grade 5 to 8.

In conceptualizing this dissertation project, I was interested both in how girls experience the moral emotions around relational aggression and also how they use those emotional experiences to decide how to respond in situations of relational aggression involving themselves and their friends. After the publication of several articles insisting that intuition, not reason, drives moral action (although reasoning still plays a secondary role) (e.g., Haidt, 2001; Pizarro, 2000), the field of moral psychology began to re-visit the question of how we make moral judgments and what motivates action. Moral emotions, thus, have become a main focus of study as we try to understand what roles these emotions play in reasoning about morality. However, the role of moral emotions in situations of relational aggression has not been

considered in depth. Much of the work in the field has been done using spontaneous utterances or with an fMRI, and while this work contributes valuable information to our knowledge of how the brain works and how intuition may affect action choices, having a qualitative understanding of lived experiences leads to the development of more complex developmental models.

This project also provides a much-needed analysis of relational aggression and how moral emotions are involved in the choices that girls make in their interpersonal conflicts, which is a first step to deepening our understanding of how girls use emotions and how aware they are of these emotions when dealing with their friends. In conducting this analysis, I also consider non-moral factors and motivations for action, as well as how living in such an interpersonal context affects the choices that girls make.

This dissertation therefore examines how adolescent girls' moral emotions affect their responses to relational aggression situations, which will contribute to the literature on moral emotion, specifically how moral emotions may affect moral action choices. I consider how girls express and reflect on their moral emotions when deciding what to do when dealing with relational aggression. Few qualitative studies exist looking at relational aggression, and even fewer studies exist that look at moral emotions in a qualitative way. A qualitative study of moral emotions is important because if girls are aware of their emotions, they can perhaps have more control over them. Rather than just reacting, girls may become more mindful. This awareness and reflection on emotions may lead to more moral behavior, as girls stand up for each other and develop more productive solutions to their conflicts.

Aggression has important developmental implications for girls—both in the personal and in the moral domains. Helping girls to transform their emotional states requires that we better understand how girls understand these emotional states, especially when dealing with moral emotions. If moral emotions do motivate moral actions, understanding how girls regulate these emotions could lead to a better grasp of why some girls act morally and some do not. This work will also contribute to a better understanding of how moral emotions affect actions within interpersonal conflicts, and perhaps more importantly, how awareness and manipulations of these emotions affect action choices.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter provides an overview of the literature on emotions, emotional awareness, and moral development as they may pertain to issues of social and relational aggression. Various models of how moral emotions affect actions are examined and compared, and applied to relational aggression situations, with a specific focus on how emotions may or may not affect actions. In addition, non-moral factors that may affect how girls react in situations of relational aggression, such as social intelligence, are examined. Despite the extensive research in these areas, a clear model of how adolescents use moral and non-moral emotions to make judgments in situations of relational aggression has not yet been identified, and this study contributes to that literature.

When people experience emotions such as fear, anger, or joy, they experience a complex mix of biological responses, learned reactions, and self-regulatory efforts. The literature in moral psychology defines emotion in myriad ways. Emotions can be considered as various conscious and unconscious processes; they can be thought of as socially learned responses to elicitors, or as biological responses to situations. These responses can occur together or separately in a complex mix in response to eliciting situations (Russell, 2003; Haidt, 2001). Emotions are important to consider in this type of social situation for several reasons. It is not just about the initial reaction to a situation that is important, but also there are the important issues of how aware one may be of a situation, and how one might use the emotional reaction to further one's own action choices and tendencies in the future.

Emotions are not only personal and social, but can be moral as well. Jonathan Haidt (2003) defines moral emotions as “those emotions that are linked to the interests or welfare of either society as a whole or at least of persons other than the judge or agent” (p. 853). In addition, moral emotions are particularly salient when involved in situations revolving around moral and interpersonal issues. These events not only affect the self, but also affect those around the self (Haidt, 2003). Further, moral emotions arise when one feels that one’s own or the rights of others have been violated (Kohlberg, 1984). This project explores both moral and non-moral emotions in the context of adolescent girls’ relational aggression. Relational aggression is a moral problem because typically it involves infringement on others’ rights, lack of respect for others as persons, and conflicts surrounding judgment of responsibility for others. When discussing issues of harm to another person, that is considered to fall within the moral domain. Typical moral emotions, such as guilt, shame, and compassion, arise frequently in relational aggression situations and other interpersonal interactions (Tangney *et al.*, 1992; Extrebarria & Apodaca, 2008; Krettenauer & Jia, 2011; Silfver & Helkama, 2007). But these moral emotions fall within the category of emotions, more generally, as well.

### ***Defining Emotions***

Several definitions of emotions exist in the literature that range, as mentioned earlier, from the biological responses, to unconscious responses, to learned responses, to a complex combination of these. In the analysis of situations of relational aggression, particularly the moral emotions surrounding girls’ responses to aggression, what might be most informative is to examine emotions from a functionalist



perspective. Sullivan et al. (2010) define the functionalist approach as looking at how “emotions serve the function of regulating interactions between individuals and their environment, organizing and motivating goal-driven behavior” (p. 32). The functionalist approach considers how emotional expressivity establishes and maintains social relationships; it is studying emotion from within an interpersonal framework (Zeman & Shipman, 1997). Emotion is thus “a source of interpersonal communication that serves specific social-regulatory functions” (Zeman & Shipman, 1997, p. 917). In essence, this analysis utilizes this functionalist approach in that specific emotion “families” (Haidt, 2003) are important for interpersonal interactions. Understanding how girls access various emotion families to meet their interpersonal goals and control their environment leads to insight as to how emotions affect the specific problem of relational aggression, which could lead to a deeper understanding of that problem. In short, examining emotions within this functionalist context could show how girls use emotions, and the regulation of those emotions, to communicate with each other and within and between social groups (Zeman & Shipman, 1997). The functionalist aspect requires a certain level of emotional awareness so that individuals can regulate their emotions to meet their own social goals.

Within the functionalist approach, “emotions are conceptualized as flexible, contextually bound, and goal directed” (Campos, Mumme, Kermoian, & Campos, 1994, p. 285). In order to study emotion within this approach, both person and context must be considered as interrelated and social goals must also be considered (Campos *et al.*, 1994). Thus, emotion “can be defined from a functionalist perspective as the attempt by the person to establish, maintain, change, or terminate the relation between

the person and the environment on matters of significance to the person” (Campos *et al.*, 1994, p. 286). This approach suggests that emotions are multifaceted and manifest in many different ways; rather than looking only at basic affect and physiological responses, we must consider the actions and goals of the individual within a certain context (Campos *et al.*, 1994; Thompson, 1994). From this perspective, “feelings function principally as signals that help one monitor the progress of person-environment relations” (Campos *et al.*, 1994, p. 292). The focus of analysis, however, is on the individual’s actions toward goals and her success at reaching those goals.

Russell (2003) divides the phenomena categorized under emotion into “basic technical concepts” and “secondary concepts” (p. 146). “Basic technical concepts” are highly specialized terms that have precise scientific definitions, as contrasted with “folk concepts” used in every day language. The “secondary concepts bridge the gap” between highly specialized and well-defined language and everyday understanding of these concepts (p. 146).

Russell (2003) uses the following table (p. 147) to define the secondary concepts:

Table 1: Secondary Emotional Concepts (Russell, 2003)

Term	Definition/Comment
Mood	<p>Prolonged core affect with no Object (simple mood) or with a quasi-Object</p> <p>This concept is fuzzy because neither duration nor degree of stability is defined.</p>
Empathy	Attributed affect caused by mental simulation of the experience of another

	The everyday term <i>empathy</i> likely implies a socially desirable affective response as well.
Displeasure Motive	Attributed affect where the core affect is displeasure and the Object is a specific deprivation  Other mechanisms for motivation are also likely.
Prototype	A cognitive structure that specifies the typical ingredients, causal connections, and temporal order for each emotion concept  Fear and other emotion concepts define categories the borders of which are fuzzy and that possess an internal structure.
Emotional episode	Any occurrent event that sufficiently fits a prototype to count as an instance of that emotion
Prototypical emotional episode	An emotion episode that matches the prototype closely
Emotional meta-experience	Perception of one's own emotional episode in terms of one or more specific emotion categories  Mediated by cognitive categories. This subjective experience is a secondary level of consciousness (Farthing, 1992).
Emotion regulation	Attempts to alter the category of emotion in which one finds oneself  Mediated by emotional meta-experience.

Russell (2003) provides definitions of emotions in the following way: “The proposed approach is called ‘psychological construction’ to emphasize that the sequence of events that make up any actual emotional episode is neither fixed by biological inheritance from the human evolutionary past (as basic emotion theories have it) nor fixed by social rules or categories (as social constructionist theories have it) but is

constructed anew each time to fit its specific circumstances” (p. 151). Russell (2003) acknowledges the biological and unconscious markers of an emotional episode, but he also argues that people have some control over some components of the emotional experience. He states, “Emotional life consists of the continuous fluctuations in core affect, in pervasive perception of affective qualities, and in the frequent attribution of core affect to a single Object, all interacting with perceptual, cognitive, and behavior processes. Occasionally, these components form one of the proto-typical patterns, just as stars form constellations” (Russell, 2003, p. 152). Therefore, Russell (2003) both defines emotions and suggests how they play out in everyday life. Particularly of import here is people’s meta-experience of emotion and the emotional regulation of that experience. This is important because it can contribute to the explanatory process of how emotions, emotional awareness, and emotional regulation interact to inform behavior.

Understanding emotion as interpersonal, communicative, and goal-directed contrasts from the more biological approaches of studying emotion. The latter approach is one, in which the biological location of a particular emotion is mapped via a brain scan (Greene, 2004; Goleman, 2011). The former types of understanding of emotion result in studies that may be designed to elicit intuitive responses to dilemmas (Haidt, 2001), while still others may be designed to look at emotional understanding and experiencing in context.

This dissertation focuses on how every day experiences of relational aggression may affect how adolescent girls utilize their emotions to make moral decisions about how they interact within their friendship groups. In other words, this

study is limited to what Russell (2003) and others have called “secondary concepts,” or how our perception of and reflection on emotion affect our understanding of our state and our regulation of that emotion. Perhaps there are patterns of moral emotions that may occur in various types of conflicts and when girls play various roles.

The functionalist perspective focuses on the interpersonal nature of emotion and how those emotions drive goal-directed behavior. Two key components of achieving these goals are emotional regulation and emotional awareness, and the actions that result from these processes. The question of action has been the most debated concept with social psychology and is of significant concern in relational aggression. Emotions play a role in the perception of and reaction to of moral situations, and thus various models of action have been proposed. The next section reviews these models to examine whether and how emotions figure into the action sequence, and thus enhance the functionalist role of emotion and emotion families in relational aggression contexts. These models also may suggest how emotions play a role in development (both in psychological development, as well as in inducing more moral action).

### ***Moral Motivation for Action and the Relationship to Emotion***

Ever since Blasi’s (1980) foundational paper suggesting the development of the moral self as critical for motivating moral action, the question of what drives moral action has been debated within the field of moral psychology. Blasi (1999) argues that while emotion itself may not drive action, the conscious awareness of motivation, and manipulating it to align with one’s self-image, may indeed turn one into a moral agent. The next section considers the various models of the relationship between emotion and action, with a special emphasis on the motivation to act, which may become an

important part of the analysis of the relational aggression data.

Moral emotions affect both moral motivation and action and have some relationship to perception of moral problems and of moral judgments. Increasing awareness of moral emotions and how these emotions are experienced in the context of a moral problem, thought and action may change. Moreover, as moral judgment develops, abilities for empathy and perspective taking may increase as well. Three characteristics comprise moral emotions: they must be triggered by a perceived violation of rights or fairness, they must be linked to interests of those other than the self (triggered by disinterested elicitors), and they must motivate prosocial action (Kohlberg, 1984; Pizarro, 2000; Haidt, 2003; 2013). A number of models incorporate emotion, intuitions, judgments, and actions. These models will be explored individually and then compared to identify key components of the relationships between perception, emotion, and action. The models can be grouped into two primary categories: Rational and Intuitionist models. At the heart of this discussion is the question of deliberative rationality versus automaticity. One of the important considerations in looking at the relationship between individual psychology and action is the role emotion can play as a mediating variable or antecedent stimulus, and still further as a prompt for further reflection after the results of the situation become evident. As Russell (2003) and Haidt (2003; 2013) indicate,, this is a complex mix of reaction, regulation, deliberation, and reflection.

The models described below give some insight into how emotion and cognition work together to define action, but more importantly for relational aggression situations, they may provide some insight into the way that emotions

themselves are recognized by the individuals and how they work together to influence both judgment and action. Moreover, non-moral factors, such as the desire to maintain friendships, may become increasingly important as girls react and become aware of others' reactions to their emotions.

### *The rationalist approach*

Kohlberg's (1984) model of moral judgment comes from the constructive developmental perspective, and has been foundational to moral psychology. With his grounding in Kantian deontological tradition Kohlberg's (1984) model of prescriptive moral action eliminates potential irrationality that arises from emotion-based moral decision-making. His moral judgment development theory reflects the "ought" of morality, explaining how one's understanding of what one *should* do develops over time. Myriad studies have examined the relationship between Kohlbergian moral psychology stages and actual moral behavior; however Kohlberg's stage theory was not designed to address actual moral action, but rather an understanding of individual psychology about how one *conceives of and judges* moral principles and moral actions. Over time, he developed his judgment-action model, and he incorporated variables (such as conceptualization of the self as moral and as morally responsible) that account for differences between what people identified as what they ought to do and what they actually do in real life. Critiques by Blasi (1980) and Habermas (1984) led Kohlberg to consider changes to both his stage theory and moral action theory. In his model, if emotions were considered in people's moral reasoning, they were considered from a rationalist standpoint, rooted in considerations of justice operations. Thus, while Kohlberg (1984) thus did not dismiss emotion but claimed that they

motivated action or served as an underlying moral justification about why one ought to make a judgment or act in a particular way.

In looking at Kohlberg's work on moral emotions throughout his career, he made three main claims. First, Kohlberg (1984) claims that cognition and affectivity are inter-related. Thus, while emotions may be present, there is always an element of cognition as well, and thus decisions are never based on pure "irrational," emotions nor on pure reason alone. Second, moral judgments develop through social interaction, and children learn appropriate affective responses through social interactions. Finally, the cognitive definition of the emotion and the situation make it a moral emotion.

In terms of the first, the inter-relatedness, claim, it is evident that just as Kohlberg had his rationalist roots in Kant, he had his psychological roots in Piaget. Like Piaget, Kohlberg (1971) acknowledges the interconnection between affect, cognition, and social knowledge in moral judgments:

The cognitive-developmental view holds that 'cognition' and 'affect' are different aspects, or perspectives, on the same mental events, that all mental events have both cognitive and affective aspects, and that the development of mental dispositions reflects structural changes recognizable in both cognitive and affective perspectives. Moral judgments are largely about sentiments and intuitions of persons, and to a large extent they express and are justified by reference to the judger's sentiments...the quality (as opposed to the quantity) of affects involved in moral judgment is determined by its cognitive-structural development, and is part and parcel of the general development of the child's conceptions of a moral order (pp. 188-189).

While the cognitive and affective develop from the same structural base then, and while we may experience them as intertwined, Kohlberg (1984) argues that the cognition informs the affective response to the moral violation, and privileges



judgment to emotion, even while recognizing that emotions and cognitions are interrelated.

Second, Kohlberg's main claim of his constructive developmental theory is that, again like Piaget, all judgments are constructed through social interaction. It stands to reason that he would interpret his theory of emotion through the same lens. Kohlberg (1984) states, "socially communicated symbolic definitions determine the actual felt attitudes and emotions experiences by the individual in given situations" (p. 67). People learn the correct emotional responses not through reinforcement schedules, but through interactions and observations in our social environments (Kohlberg, 1984). Even though Kohlberg (1984) sees empathy as an inborn phenomenon, it is learned through social interaction: "Empathy does not have to be taught to the child or conditioned; it is a primary phenomenon" (p. 68). This observation has been confirmed not only in humans, but in primates as well (Verbeek, 2006, p. 442). Kohlberg (1984) argues that children, therefore, do not develop empathy; instead, "what development and socialization achieve is the organization of empathic phenomena into consistent sympathetic and moral concerns" (p. 68). Children learn the appropriate affective responses to moral violations through social interactions.

Finally, Kohlberg considers cognitive structures as underlying affective responses, and thus judgment of the emotion as moral happens because of cognitive structuring, not because of inherent morality of the affective response. The earlier quote indicates that emotional interpretations are based upon one's mental

dispositions—or in Kohlberg’s case, on the moral stage structure. Emotions themselves are thus similarly constructed.

Kohlberg’s model of the relationship between moral judgment and moral action identifies four functions. First is the interpretation of the situation through one’s sociomoral perspective and moral judgment stage and sub-stage (moral type). It is through one’s moral reasoning that one interprets a situation as moral and in need of moral deliberation. The second function is decision-making; the individual engages in the moral-reasoning process and determines what ought to be done. Third, the individual must consider non-moral factors, such as her own personal moral responsibility to act. Fourth, there is follow-through, in which factors such as ego and IQ determine whether the individual can act.

This model has earned Kohlberg the label of rationalist. Despite the inclusion of “softer” factors such as judgment of responsibility, he primarily considers cognitive factors and rational decision-making. This model seems inadequate given recent theories that suggest the primacy of affect over cognition (for example, Haidt, 2007; 2013). These theories indicate that deliberative reasoning is not the process by which most people make decisions. Instead, the human mind operates through a rapid affective system, rather than through a slower deliberative process (Zajonc, 1980; Kahneman & Tversky, 1973; Kahneman, 2011). In summary, these quick, affective reactions drive our actions most of the times. Furthermore, in the case of relational aggression, non-moral factors may have more of a driving force in motivating action than might deliberative judgments.

For Kohlberg, moral judgments have “the central function of resolving interpersonal or social conflicts, that is, conflicts of claims or rights... Thus, moral judgments and principles imply a notion of equilibrium, or reversibility of claims. In this sense they ultimately involve some reference to justice” (Kohlberg, 1984, p. 216). Moral emotions, then, should be those emotions that occur when deciding these claims of justice or rights—the emotions that girls may feel when their rights (or the rights of others) are being violated. This is a slightly different definition from Haidt (2003) who argues that moral emotions always involve the violation of the rights of others (they cannot be elicited simply by feeling that the one’s own rights have been violated), and Haidt also gives stronger motivational force to moral emotions and intuitions than does Kohlberg.

Elaborating on Kohlberg’s model, Rest (1984) clarifies the relationship between moral judgment and moral action. He developed a four-component model consisting of the following: “moral sensitivity (interpreting the situation), moral judgment (judging which action is morally right/wrong), moral motivation (prioritizing moral values relative to other values), and moral character (having courage, persisting, overcoming distractions, implementing skills)” (Rest, 1994, p. 23). Moral sensitivity is the awareness of the moral problem; moral judgment is the deontic choice of what ought to be done; moral motivation is the drive to get involved; and all of this leads to moral action.

In Rest’s model, moral emotion can come into play at any point throughout the model. Emotions may make someone more aware of the moral problem and thus trigger the judgment process. Moral emotions are also the complementary process to

moral judgment, as suggested by Kohlberg and described in the section above. Moral emotions may also be a part of the motivation to act once an individual has judged the problem as a moral violation. Once the action has been taken, moral emotions can be used to inform subsequent actions. While Rest (1984) does not explicitly state these emotion-based relationships, it is clear from his description of his model that the study of moral emotion can overlay his four-component model. Notably, moral motivations--the priority to do the right thing--must be stronger than other motivations, such as desire to maintain the social group. In either Rest's or Kohlberg's model, there is an important aspect of the relationship between moral judgment and action that involves more than a cognitive deliberative process; some of it involves emotion, and some involves something else, such as ego control or a sense of personal responsibility. These aspects of the model were suggested, in fact, by earlier work by Augusto Blasi in his seminal 1980 article, *Bridging the Gap Between Moral Judgment and Moral Action*. Blasi determined that something beyond cognition was needed to explain moral action. His work suggested that Kohlberg was right in that moral reasoning has some role in moral action, but questioned Kohlberg's assumption that moral reasoning itself was motive enough for action. Blasi proposed that the conceptualization of a moral self is that which is critical for motivating action; that the self would be conceptualized around moral principles, and in not acting in accordance with those principles, would undercut their self-understanding and their identity (Blasi, 1980; 1999). Blasi's work, however, did not shed much light on the intuition versus rational deliberation debate.

Nucci (2001) argues that emotions and cognition are woven together: “The importance of affective tags for the cognitive system is that without such value heuristic, there wouldn’t be enough cognitive capacity or time for the most capable person to examine all possibilities and arrive at optimal solutions that arise in common situations” (p. 108). In other words, our emotions help us to create privileged thinking patterns or “schemas”—ways that we like to react in response to certain situations. By creating such valued schemas, we can react seemingly intuitively in different situations and do not have to consciously weigh all responses all the time. Our emotions help us to create cognitive solutions that are “good enough” (Nucci, 2001, p. 108). Nucci (2001) notes that in the moral domain emotions take even more of a center stage because “they are part and parcel of the very content of the domain” (p. 111). Moral decisions involve other people, so they necessarily involve emotions, whether sadness, anger, or compassion.

In total, these rationalist theories maintain the primacy of cognition over affectivity when trying to explain the relationship between moral judgment and moral action. In contrast, the emotionist and intuitionist approaches discussed below argue that in most cases, emotion drives both judgment and action. In those models, deliberative reasoning occurs only in certain situations, as a form of after the fact reasoning, or as cognitive correction to initial emotional reactions.

#### *The intuitionist approach*

A group of scholars has been exploring the role of emotion and intuition in moral judgments and action (e.g. Haidt, 2001; Pizarro, 2000; Greene, *et al.*, 2004; Haidt, 2013; Rozin & Haidt, 2013; Sherman & Haidt, 2013; Krettenauer, Malti, &

Sokol, 2008; Krettenaur & Johnston, 2011; Malti & Keller, 2010; Eisenberg, 2000; Malti & Latzko, 2010). These researchers suggest that rationalist models inadequately explain the process of judgment. Instead, judgments happen quickly, within little use of cognition except when reflecting or incorporating past experiences, or when justifying *a priori* decisions and actions based on emotion. Further, they find that individuals in real life have to make decisions in uncertain conditions and without the ability to reason rationally through all options. This is not different from Haidt's social intuitionist model.

In his groundbreaking work, Haidt (2001) argues that individuals' intuitions drive their moral judgments and that reasoning is used after the fact to justify these intuitions, and perhaps even emotions. While deliberative moral reasoning can play a role in moral judgments, Haidt (2001) argues that this type of deliberative reasoning occurs after the intuitive judgments are made. This reasoning, when it does occur, can shape future intuitions and choices on how to act. For example, studies have demonstrated that people have nearly instantaneous reactions to moral violations, and these reactions predict moral judgments. These reactions can be manipulated and these reactions can alter moral judgments. Moral "dumbfounding" then results, in which people feel that something is wrong but cannot explain why it is wrong (Pizarro & Bloom, 2003; Hauser, 2006). Lastly, people engage in "confirmation bias," which is using reasoning to confirm their initial intuition while discounting information that disagrees with their initial judgment (Haidt, 2007). Uhlman, Pizarro, Tannenbaum, and Ditto (2009) demonstrate this as well, specifically that in order to justify political beliefs, individuals will selectively favor moral principles. In other words, context

matters when individuals are making and justifying moral decisions. In looking at such highly contextual situation such as those that occur in relational aggression, this selective favoring of one principle over another may become relevant.

Pizarro (2000) provides four ways in which the emotion of empathy plays a role in moral judgments. This work has similarities to Rest (1984) and notes the importance of empathy for perceiving the moral problem. Specifically, the components of his model are:

1A: Moral signaling (parallel to what Rest, 1984, called moral sensitivity): Moral beliefs, empathic arousal, and moral judgments are all in line with each other

1B: Correction of moral beliefs: moral judgment leads to a correction of moral beliefs

1C: Empathic suppression: Make a judgment, then suppress empathy

1D: Emotive exclusion: Beliefs lead to judgment. Empathy is not a part of the moral judgment.

In Haidt's model, the focus is on how moral judgments are formed, specifically on how unconscious motives influence judgment and how emotions affect moral judgments. His recent work on disgust and political belief bring together emotion foundations, reasoning, and intuitive/biological aspects of emotion, and religion (Inbar, Pizarro, Iyer, & Haidt, 2012; Haidt, 2013).

Like other social intuitionist theorists, he discusses the judgment-action link, preferencing the intuitive over the rational judgment links in moral psychology. His work on emotional states, specifically anger, disgust, and fear, affect how people think about critical moments in their lives and how these emotions affect moral judgments. This work connects to work on Dual Process theory, and research on System 1 and

System 2 (Kahneman & Tversky, 1973). System 1 is our automatic feeling system. Most people don't control it, and it is where intuitive judgments are based. System 2 is the more deliberative system of rational thought. Kahneman (2003) argues that this system is not activated as easily because it requires energy and deliberations. Kahneman (2003) argues that most of the codes, System 1 works very well, and Haidt (2001/2007) maintains that as well—most of the codes, our intuitive moral judgments guide us. However, as needed, we can use our System 2, deliberative reasoning, to solve problems.

In moral foundations theory, Haidt and others lay out a theoretical explanation attempting to bring together the universality of morality with the cultural variations that can also be observed. Haidt (2012, 2013) argues that there are universal systems on which local ethical narratives are then constructed. This theory attempts to bridge Shweder's local ethical theory with Kohlberg's universal ethical structures with recent research on the biological foundations of emotion. Haidt's (2012) work on this theory has focused on political divides, primarily within the United States, although he and his collaborators continue to collect data broadly. Haidt claims three principles about morality: 1) intuitions come before reason; 2) there are more foundations than harm and fairness; and 3) morality both brings us together as a society but blinds us to biases and "truth" (Haidt, 2013). In making these claims, Haidt (2013) integrates the recent work on neurobiology, offers an explanation for cultural variance of morality, and raises a warning about how group identity can prevent moral thinking and action. This also relates directly to his earlier Social Intuitionist Model (Haidt, 2001).



Haidt's model and similar types of research into moral emotions have found significant empirical support, suggesting that moral reasoning may be driven by intuitions instead of deliberative processes (Haidt, 2007). Again, Haidt does not discount deliberative reasoning, but he argues that reasoning does not occur as frequently as a primary force in decision making as intuitive judgment. Like Kohlberg, Haidt (2007) sees affectivity and cognition as related, as two different types of cognition. In her critique of Haidt, Haste (2013) argues that while moral foundations theory is an important evolution within the field of moral psychology, Haidt (2012, 2013) fails to properly contextualize moral responses and choose examples that are U.S.-centric. Haste (2013) also argues that Haidt's theories do not go far enough in bridging the affect-cognition divide, which recent neurobiological research has suggested is less of a divide and more of a systemic process (Duncan & Barrett, 2007; Haste, 2013).

This work seems to build on Kahneman (2011) and others, who argue that there is a dual-process model at work when human beings make decisions. In System 1, individuals engage in very little cognitive processing and instead react intuitively. In System 2, deeper cognitive processes are used and systems of deliberative reasoning are accessed. Kahneman (2003) argues that System 1 is used more frequently than System 2 because of the biological demands on the brain when system 2 is engaged. They find that when there is a strong intuition, individuals rely on that intuition to solve the problem. Each of these theorists view emotions as primary in signaling a moral problem. For example, Greene et al. (2004) developed a theory that argues that individuals use one type of reasoning when dealing with personal

dilemmas and another type when dealing with impersonal dilemmas. When dealing with impersonal dilemmas (dilemmas in which one of the three criteria is not met) humans instead tend to use a “cognitive” utilitarian way of reasoning that maximizes the greatest good for the greatest number. Cognitive control processes override emotional responses when it has a utilitarian benefit (when the benefits outweigh the costs). They suggest that social-emotional processes enforce the deontological parts of morality and the cognitive processes are more utilitarian. Greene’s most recent work is elaborating on the dual process theory of moral judgment, which essentially examines how the traditionally –defined deontological moral judgments that Kohlberg and his colleagues examined are influenced by automatic or emotion-based reactions. He is focused on examining the moral judgment process from all possible perspectives including emotions, reasoning, and brain-based theories.

Goleman (2011) provides a useful overview of how our understanding of how emotions and morality are hardwired within the brain, thus supporting the intuitionist or System 1 side of the debate. There are areas within the brain that affect emotion, motivation, and self-awareness, and even though the famous case of Phineas Gage in 1859 demonstrated the importance of brain structure to personality, new studies have located regions within the brain that have important influences over our biological emotional responses (Goleman, 2011). fMRI mapping, done by Greene (2004) shows that when considering moral problems, specific areas of the brain are activated. More recent research suggests that rather than seeing localized brain activation when considering moral problems, there is instead activity all over the brain, suggesting a

more systemic process (Haste, 2013; Helzer & Pizarro, 2011; Duncan & Barrett, 2007; Greene, 2008).

While this biology is critical in understanding how our emotionality and morality may develop over time and especially in understanding special populations such as those with traumatic brain injury and how such injuries might affect one's life, this biological basis is not the only explanation for the relationship between emotions and actions. Citing Marcus (2004), Haidt (2012) argues that the brain is "prewired," rather than "hardwired," and that while the brain may be "organized in advance of experience," the experiences that we have in childhood and adolescence create the schemas through which we look at the world and make moral decisions.

#### *Comparison of approaches*

In comparing these schools of thought, three issues can be highlighted. First, both the rationalist theorists and theorists looking at emotion and social intuition agree that affectivity and cognition are two components of the same system. Whether an individual makes a decision using emotion or using deliberative thought, she is still engaging cognitively with the problem. Second, while rationalists are engaging with the gap between moral judgment and moral action, the emotion and intuitive theorists are simply engaging with the question of what drives moral judgments. Rationalists are considering how individual reasoning may lead to moral action, whereas social intuitionists are identifying how judgments are made. While this may seem like a small distinction, it's important to clarify that fundamentally, these two schools are looking at different components of the moral process. Third, both rationalists and social intuitionists agree that deliberative reasoning is not enough to explain moral

judgments. In the case of rationalists, emotion, moral identity, ego controls, IQ, and judgments of responsibility have all been suggested as possible components that may explain how moral judgments become moral actions. Social intuitionists have suggested a kind of dual-process model, in which most decisions are made quickly and intuitively, and then deliberative reasoning is engaged. In both schools, this additional component has a connection to affectivity. Finally, both schools of thought argue that moral judgments are influenced by social factors. Rationalists consider how social interactions shape both deliberative reasoning and affective responses, while social intuitionists look at the contexts in which decisions are made, and how manipulating the conditions of these contexts can affect the judgments made.

Helion and Pizarro (2013) suggest that emotional regulation may play an important role in understanding the relationship between moral emotions and actions, and that individuals learn to regulate emotions to best respond to these situations (Tamir, 2009). They argue that goal-driven emotional regulation may better explain how two individuals arrive at different judgments when presented with the same stimuli (Helion & Pizarro, 2013). While their theory is currently limited to looking at the prototypical moral emotion of disgust, it has interesting implications for how individuals may regulate their emotions while thinking not only of the moral problem, but also of other social goals. Haste (2013) argues that emotions, unlike intuitive judgments, may be more available for post-hoc reasoning, and that understanding this type of emotional regulation may be the next step in describing the interplay between cognition and emotion in moral reasoning.

### ***Non-Moral Considerations: Social Information Processing***

In considering why individuals may want to regulate their emotions when dealing with moral problems such as relation aggression, it's useful to consider non-moral social goals. I review some of these topics that may be relevant in situations of relational aggression, such as different types of aggression and social intelligence.

#### *Theories of aggression*

Building on the work of Bandura and other social learning theorists, Crick and Dodge (1996) suggest that there are two different types of aggression: reactive and proactive. Reactive aggression is prompted by fear and frustration, whereas proactive aggression is used by individuals to control the social group (p. 993). Within this model, children and adolescents who can correctly read and interpret social cues are able to avoid aggressive behavior, while children who cannot interpret these cues lash out in aggressive ways (even leading to conduct disorder). Furthermore, children who successfully read the cues may choose proactive aggression if they feel that this aggression will lead to positive social outcomes (Crick & Dodge, 1996). In this model, then, children and adolescents either react to emotions and provide negative attribution to others (reactive aggression) or read the social scene in a sophisticated way and use aggression to change the social scene (proactive aggression). Dodge and Coie (1987) found that adolescents who utilized proactive aggression were seen as leaders, whereas those who used reactive aggression typically ascribed negative intent to peers before aggressing. In fact, children who experienced early peer rejection became antisocial as they aged, suggesting the power of the peer group in influencing later development (Dodge, Lansford, Burks, Bates, Pettit, Fontaine & Price, 2003).

Behavior, then, is motivated not by moral concerns, but by defensiveness or by wanting to consolidate personal power. Incorporating Bandura's earlier work, behavior is this a function of the person and the environment, in that an individual's social and emotional awareness, combined with their social environment, leads to their social behavior (Bandura, 1977). When considering relational aggression, these non-moral motivations for behavior must also be considered.

### *Social intelligence*

Goleman (2007) not only addresses the psycho-biological aspects of emotion, but also is known for his argument that social intelligence is a combination of social awareness and social facility, and that having social intelligence is necessary for successful relationships, as well as for physical health. Girls who have high social intelligence may engage in relational aggression as a way of controlling the group and maintaining their social status (Crick & Grotpeter, 1996). Goleman (2007) in fact argues that these social connections and emotions affect our biology—in other words, our social encounters affect our biological priming, not simply the other way around. In intense situations like relational aggression, the social dynamic affects the emotional experience, just as the regulation of the emotional experience affects the social dynamic. In addition to moral awareness and sensitivity, girls experiencing relational aggression also utilize social intelligence to read and respond to the situations involving themselves and their friends.

### ***Moral Emotions and Emotion Families***

The discussion thus far has focused on theoretical underpinnings of morality and how moral judgments are made and then translated into action, as well as a brief

discussion of non-moral motivations of behavior. Now the focus turns to specific moral emotions and how these emotions play out in situations of relational aggression. Although there may be non-moral motivations of the behavior, relational aggression is a moral problem because it involves violations of the rights of others. This makes it distinct from a conventional problem, which is arbitrary, socially regulated rules that can vary from culture to culture and can change based on cultural conventions (Turiel, 1983). This dissertation project focuses on moral emotions, which are emotions that occur in the context of moral problems that connect to prosocial action. This is consistent with Haidt's (2003) definition, which suggests that moral emotions and emotions may overlap, but moral emotions are elicited by disinterested factors and cause prosocial action. The following section will describe emotion, emotional constellations, and families, and the literature that contextualizes them within the moral domain.

In keeping with the analysis of how emotion may influence moral decisions, Krettenauer, Jia, & Mosleh (2011) suggest three ways in which emotion may affect this process. First, moral emotions may follow transgressing; second, they may cause certain actions; and finally, they may regulate future actions. This third way may have particular importance in determining moral action (Blasi, 1999; Baumeister *et al.*, 2007; Tangney *et al.*, 2007). Moreover, antisocial and prosocial behaviors may be governed by separate regulatory systems, specifically that "in antisocial behavioral contexts, failing to act morally typically triggers negatively charged self-evaluative emotions. In prosocial contexts, failing to act morally is accompanied by less intense negatively charged self-evaluative emotions. Instead, positively charged self-

evaluative emotions such as pride over acting prosocially are more pronounced” (Krettenauer *et al.*, 2011, p. 360; Krettenauer & Johnston, 2010). Thus, Krettenauer et al. (2011) argue that positive self-evaluative emotions predict prosocial action in prosocial contexts, whereas negative self-evaluative emotions predict prosocial action in antisocial contexts. Therefore, in situations of relational aggression, one would predict that feelings of guilt would trigger action more than would thinking about positive upstanding emotions. Their study proved this hypothesis, and further found that in prosocial situations, negative self-evaluative emotions did not increase the likelihood that an adolescent would make a moral choice. As adolescents got older, this effect became more pronounced; in prosocial contexts, guilt had less of an influence on moral choice than in younger groups. Moreover, “older adolescents pay attention not only to self-evaluative feelings but also to nonmoral outcome-oriented emotions” (Krettenauer *et al.*, 2011, p. 367). The study used for the current analyses used hypothetical dilemmas, and Krettenauer et al. (2011) warn that it may therefore not be generalizable to all real-life situations.

Krettenauer et al. (2011) emphasize how important emotions are to how individuals choose to act when faced with moral dilemmas, which further begs the question of what these emotions are and how they are elicited. We turn to an examination of moral emotions and emotion families, to help shed light on how to understand how a moral problem such as relational aggression involves emotions, and how those emotions influence action.



### *Four emotion families*

Haidt (2003) defines moral emotions as those triggered by disinterested elicitors and cause prosocial action tendencies. Furthermore, they are linked to the interests and welfare of individuals, interpersonal interaction and society as a whole. He argues that emotions triggered by “disinterested elicitors...can be considered a prototypical moral emotion” (p. 854)—meaning that the emotion must be triggered by elicitors that do not only affect the self but that also affect those around the self. The more disinterested the elicitor, the more moral the emotion. Additionally, moral emotions tend to encourage “prosocial action tendencies”—meaning that the action “either benefit[s] others or else uphold or benefit the social order” (Haidt, 2003, p. 854).

Haidt (2003) divides the moral emotions into “two large and two small joint families”—using the metaphor of the Indian family, where “several brothers and their wives and children live together, often with each subfamily in an adjoining hut, within a single compound” (Haidt, 2003, p. 855). Each emotion may be different but is related to others—hence grouped within the “family.” The two large families are:

- “Other-condemning”: anger, contempt, and disgust (children: indignation and loathing). United by “negative feelings about the actions or character of others” (Haidt, 2003, p. 856)
- “Self-conscious”: shame, embarrassment, and guilt

The two small families are:

- “Other-suffering”: compassion (related to Distress At Another’s Distress—or DAAD)

- “Other-praising”: gratitude and elevation

The families of emotion are considered in the next sections, along with research that articulates how it is that these emotions have been examined or understood in the context of moral problems, and particularly in relational aggression.

### *Other-condemning*

The other-condemning family includes anger, contempt, and disgust, driven by negative feelings about others. Within this family, much of the literature centers around the concept of anger, and that anger can have different expressions in adolescence, specifically adolescent girls tend to hide, suppress, and attempt to regulate their anger through disengagement (Brown, 2003).

Righteous anger (Tangney *et al.*, 2007) is triggered when one perceives another being unjustly hurt. While girls do express this type of anger, they have a much more complex relationship with the emotion. Decades of work have shown that as they age, girls learn to hide their anger from others and face social implications from both their peers and adults when they do not do so (Brown, 2003). Girls, especially white, middle-class girls, are expected to get along with others and learn to hide behind a “mask” that conceals their true emotional states (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Brown, 2003).

Cox, Stabb, and Hulgus (2000), in their study of middle-school aged girls, found that girls were more likely than boys to suppress their anger, but that this suppression did not lead to higher levels of depression, as they had hypothesized it would. Discussing reasons behind this suppression, Hatch and Forgays (2001) argue that as they age, girls become more and more aware that anger can lead to social

isolation and emotional distress, so women channel that anger to indirect displays of aggression. They argue that anger is triggered by violations of fair play and that targets of this anger are those who violate those expectations. Context also plays a role; women will regulate their emotions based on the context in which they are. Concern about how the target feels and about being seen as angry affected whether women and girls expressed anger. Moreover, girls and women only became angry after careful consideration of the overall fairness of the situation and if the situation had occurred before. Even when they felt anger, girls and women controlled how they expressed that anger; if they were in public, they were careful not to blow up.

Peled and Moretti (2007) note that when provoked, women are more likely to distract from anger than they are to ruminate on it. Peled and Moretti (2007) found that both anger and anger rumination were independent predictors of relational aggression. Peled and Moretti (2007) suggest that interventions, then, must target both the cognitive (rumination on anger) and the emotional (anger). Peled and Moretti (2007) found that girls do indeed report more anger rumination than boys do. Comparing Peled and Moretti's (2007) findings to the models already presented, the interplay between affectivity and cognition becomes clear, in that it's not only about regulating the emotion, but also about approaching the thinking around anger and conflict that may lead to a decrease in relational aggression. In the social intuitionist model, this change would come through reflection after the incident has passed.

In further support of the models that connect cognition and affect, Smith and Thomas (2000), in a national interview and online survey, found that violent girls were more likely to display generalized anger, whereas nonviolent girls showed localized

anger at specific injustices. Violent girls also showed more symptoms of embodied anger than did nonviolent girls. This work suggests that girls who experience anger and cannot name that anger are more likely to harm others. Girls who can direct that anger at specific instances may not lash out physically at others. Underwood et al. (1999) discovered that contrary to their expectations (and previous research) girls expressed less anger than boys did when provoked in a laboratory setting. Girls were less likely to respond to provocative comments.

In her qualitative study of urban girls of color, Way (1995) found that her respondents spoke about the importance on confronting friends and “speaking one’s mind” in important relationships. In fact, being able to confront friends was the sign of a deeper friendship and connection. The girls in Way’s (1995) sample, however, did fear speaking their minds to boys with the risk that the boys would abandon them. Way (1995) suggests that parental socialization, coupled with dealing with institutionalized racism, might force poor, urban girls of color to speak their minds and stand up for themselves in ways that white, middle- and upper-class girls may not experience. Furthermore, white girls may learn from their black peers how to speak out in relationships. The question thus arises if the expression of anger or other other-condemning emotions is culturally influenced, specific to gender, or more fundamentally, a question of the connection between cognition and affect.

Girls within the inner city may be culturally influenced to act out other-condemning emotions based on their social-cultural context. In other words, this could be an example of what Marcus (2004) highlights—we are born with the cognitive structure and the emotion, but our life experiences shape the ways in which we react.

Moreover, girls with negative life experiences may use reactive aggression based on their hostile attributions of others' motivations (Crick & Dodge, 1996). Like Way (1995), Ness (2010) finds that inner-city violence is generational and argues that girls who fight do so in order to demonstrate their integrity and their identity, as well as change their spot within the social hierarchy. Schrader (2011) argues that while Ness (2010) provides a compelling account of the generational and personal reasons behind why girls fight, she could delve further into the cultural, social, and economic reasons behind this violence, and in particular, how understandings of gender play out differently among diverse groups of adolescent girls.

Contempt, or hatred for others, is a rejection of the other. The other is seen as beneath the self (Haidt, 2003). Ekman, Davidson, Ricard, and Wallace (2005) discuss "hatred," which seems to be a combination of what Haidt (2003) terms disgust and contempt. Like a typical disgust reaction, those experiencing hatred emphasize all negative qualities of the hated object, and like with contempt, the hated object is rejected and cast out from the group. Disgust, according to Haidt (2003) and Tangney et al. (2007) is often triggered by seeing something as unclean or by violation of purification rituals. Moreover, contempt and disgust are less likely to trigger moral behavior when compared to anger (Tangney et al., 2007). It's unclear whether disgust is a relevant concept within relational aggression; however, Haidt (2003) conceptualizes it as a part of the other-condemning family.<sup>1</sup> Currently, no literature exists looking at disgust within relational aggression, although it may play some role in how girls treat each other. As Haidt (2012) and others have pointed out, disgust has significant implications for political affiliations and the group connections inherent

within that. Girls who feel disgust toward others may isolate them from their peer group. Haidt (2013) also notes that “morality binds and blinds,” meaning that shared moral values both bring groups together and keep them from seeing their own moral failings.

While righteous anger may trigger intervention on behalf of a victim, on the whole the other-condemning family can lead to isolation and rejection (Haidt, 2003). Moreover, in the case of anger, literature has shown that adolescent girls have a myriad of responses, which are affected by culture, previous experiences, and social pressure. While girls may become angry on behalf of others, they also may regulate that response based on the overall social environment. Unlike the other families discussed below, the other-condemning family may be most regulated by adolescent girls, as expressing and being targets of these emotions may lead to isolation from the group.

#### *Self-conscious*

The self-conscious family includes such emotions such as shame, embarrassment, and guilt. Combined with the other-condemning family, the self-conscious family is a part of Haidt’s (2003) “large” families. Tangney et al. (2007) note three ways in which researchers have tried to differentiate between shame and guilt. First, is through examining eliciting events—empirically there is not a difference between events that elicit shame and events that elicit guilt. Second, they consider whether the transgression occurs public or private. While shame is seen as public and guilt is seen as private, empirically there is not evidence to back up this distinction. Both shame and guilt tend to be public events and noticed by others. Third, is whether

the individual sees the event as a failing of self or a failing of behavior. This is the key distinction between shame and guilt; shame is seen as a failing of the self, whereas guilt is seen as a failure to behave well. Guilt inspires amending, other-focused empathy, and constructive reactions to anger, while shame inspires hiding, self-oriented distress, and destructive anger. Shamed individuals tend to externalize and blame others in order to cope. In order to deal with the negative feelings surrounding the self, an individual may transform those feelings into outwardly focused, other-condemning anger.

Guilt and shame can be triggered by similar situations, but have very different effects. Guilt involves negatively assessing the action that one has done and thinking about what one should have done, whereas shame involves blaming the self and viewing the self as a failure for one's actions (Benetti-McQuoid & Bursik, 2005; Kubany & Watson, 2003). Shame involves a negative evaluation of the self in a global way (Kubany & Watson, 2003; Tangney, 1996). In order to alleviate guilt, a change in behavior is made, but in order to alleviate shame, the individual attempts to change the self. Feeling guilt can cause an individual to become more empathic and change her behavior, whereas shame is linked with psychological maladjustment and anger. Girls tend to experience more guilt than boys do (Tangney, 1991; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992).

Tangney, Miller, Flicker, and Barlow (1996) found that shame, guilt, and embarrassment are distinct emotions, and embarrassment is less related to shame and guilt. Moreover, these are qualitatively different emotions; the differences were not explained by differences in degree of moral violations. These emotions, however, are

not only self-conscious but also other-conscious; they involve thinking about how others appraise the self.

Haidt (2003) argues that in interdependent culture, shame and embarrassment overlap considerably, and given how intensely interpersonal adolescent girls are, it is unsurprising to see this overlap between emotions.

Tangney et al. (1992) found that among undergraduates, being prone to shame led to more indirect hostility and more anger. Given that girls use relational aggression to accomplish social goals and shame is a global negative self-evaluation, girls may be using the aggression to show that they have friends and assuage these negative evaluations. Shame involves an idea of public disapproval, even if the public is the “internalized other” (Tangney *et al.*, 1992, p. 670). Guilt motivates making amends and making things better, whereas shame makes an individual want to disappear. Tangney et al. (1992) argue that in the shame-to-anger sequence, an individual attempts to take control of a shaming situation by lashing out and being aggressive. Specifically, shame “tends to initiate a particular type of anger episode, namely, an irrational and generally counterproductive rage reaction” (Tangney *et al.*, 1992, p. 670).

Caprara et al. (2001), in their study of European adolescents, found that an individual feels guilty when one believes that one’s behavior has put oneself in the position to offer reparations or has failed in one’s obligations. Further, the need for reparation is negatively related to aggression and positively associated with prosocial behavior. Fear of punishment may lead to an increase in aggressive behavior, as a person tries to control the punishment or deal with negative affect. In other words, the



negative effect of guilt can enhance “both need for reparation and fear of punishment for one’s own wrongdoing” (Caprara *et al.*, 2001, p. 232).

Hoffman (1998) sees interpersonal guilt as linked with empathy; “when an individual feels empathic pain and sees [herself] as being responsible for another person’s pain, then the empathic experience tends to transform itself into guilt” (Extrebarria & Apodaca, 2008, p. 160). Baumeister *et al.* (1994) argue that guilt is rooted “in the human capacity to feel others’ pain and...in anxiety over rejection by others” (Extrebarria & Apodaca, 2008, p. 161). Frijda (1993) also argues for such an interpersonal conceptualization. Guilt often leads to other-oriented empathy, and thus should prompt more prosocial behavior, especially in the antisocial context of relational aggression (Krettenauer *et al.*, 2011). However, “group-based shame is most likely elicited when a threatened shared identity is salient—that is, when concerns about maintaining a positive group identity arise. Vicarious guilt, on the other hand, is more likely when one’s interpersonal dependence with the perpetrator is salient, and when relational-based concerns are highlighted by a focus on harm to another group or individual” (Tangney *et al.*, 2007, p. 359; cf. Lickel *et al.*, 2004, 2005, 2006). Group-based shame may be more productive than individual shame—group-based shame may motivate change amongst group members. Tapping into group-based shame may be an effective way of getting girls to reflect on their actions and how they treat each other.

Silfver and Helkama (2007) found that girls experience more guilt over inaction and more empathy arousal than did boys. Guilt tends to be rather context-dependent, although it is associated with empathy and cognitive perspective taking.

Girls seemed more willing to express their emotions in writing and were more comfortable identifying themselves as emotional. Williams and Bybee (1994) found that as children age, guilt over situations not their fault declines. Girls tend to feel guilty for violating compassion and trust norms.

While guilt, shame, and embarrassment may have very similar elicitors, they have different expressions and action tendencies. Shame leads to condemnation of the self, externalizing anger, and blame. Guilt leads to condemnation of one's behavior, fear of punishment, and prosocial behavior. Embarrassment leads to either condemnation of the self or condemnation of behavior (depending on context), self-consciousness, and conciliatory behavior. Individuals prone to embarrassment, like adolescent girls, may be more vulnerable to peer pressure so that they can fit into the group (Tangney *et al.*, 2007). Thus, if girls deem themselves "not responsible" for incidences of RA, they may not feel guilty. Moreover, we do see that girls feel guilty when they betray their friends, the individuals with whom they share compassion and trust norms. Overall, girls felt more guilt more intensely.

#### *Other-suffering*

Other-suffering is the first of Haidt's (2003) small emotion families. Haidt (2003) argues that distress at another's distress (DAAD) is the form of compassion expressed by infants, who will cry when in the presence of another infant's distress. In his conceptualization of compassion, Haidt (2003) brings together work on empathy and sympathy, arguing that compassion, as a construct, is more productive as a moral emotion as the field moves forward. DAAD is the inborn empathy which newborns experience; as individuals age, they are able to engage in more sophisticated forms of

perspective taking and thus can develop a deeper sense of connection to others' suffering.

The other-suffering emotion of compassion has important connections to morality and moral behavior. Compassion involves perspective taking and imagining how the other must feel; literally imagining the suffering of the other (Haidt, 2003). Neff (2003b) argues that "compassion involves being touched by the suffering of others, opening one's awareness to other's pain, and not avoiding or disconnecting from it, so that feelings of kindness toward others and the desire to alleviate their suffering emerge" (pp. 86-87).

Like Haidt (2003), this definition requires that compassionate individuals are perceptive of others' emotional states, are willing to experience that suffering on an emotional level. Neff (2003b) goes further in stating that compassion can manifest being kind toward the other, not judging, and realizing that all humans have failings and we all fail (Neff, 2003b). In the case of relational aggression, girls who have compassion for others or who view themselves as compassionate individuals may be more likely to act prosocially in situations of relational aggression in order to help others. A compassionate girl would have to attune to the emotional states of her friends, remain open to those states (even if she felt pressure to ignore in order to please the bully) and do something to make the suffering of the victim better (that could be either upstanding or consoling after the incident). Moreover, even if the compassionate girl saw the victim as having violated the social rules, the compassionate girl would realize that all girls violate those rules at some time and not judge the girls for the violation.

### *Other-praising*

The other-praising emotions family is a small family consisting of gratitude and elevation and involves recognizing the goodness in others, and in the case of elevation, being in awe of that goodness. Gratitude can be triggered by experiencing another person's benevolence and often triggers further prosocial and moral action by the recipient of the beneficence (Tangney et al., 2007). Gratitude can also encourage further helping behavior and has positive mental health effects for those who experience it (Tangney et al., 2007).

Elevation, according to Haidt (2003), is triggered by witnessing humanity's best nature and also by feeling oneself in the presence of the divine. Seeing others perform good deeds, such as standing up for someone who is being victimized, can trigger this emotion.

Although all of these emotions have been studied in their simpler forms, the focus has not necessarily been on the more complex forms of these emotions, "on which human morality depends" (Haidt, 2003, p. 855). Haidt (2003) further states that while emotions are biologically evolved within the human being, they are also "cultural scripts that are shaped by local values and meanings"—which is why understanding the context in which the emotion is experienced is so important in understanding if the emotion is a moral emotion and how it may motivate action tendencies in the individual experiencing it. Haidt (2003) emphasizes the same point as Russell (2003), namely that the term "emotion" refers to several distinct psychological and social processes that must be considered on many different levels.

In summary, moral emotions affect how motivated individuals are to act morally and have some relationship to how they perceive moral problems and think about them. Becoming more aware of these emotions and the experiencing of them in the context of a moral problem may influence thinking or actions.

### ***Moral Emotions, Action, and Relational Aggression***

The nature of relational aggression involves emotions, violation of rights, issues of harm, and negative effects on others and the larger social group, qualifies it as a moral problem. Therefore, it's important to analyze this problem through the lens of the literature on emotion. Relational aggression is the specific use of relationships to harm others—threatening to end a friendship or threatening someone's social ties (Underwood, 2003). The term relational aggression, however, is often used synonymously with social aggression (damaging one's social status and relationships) and indirect aggression (relational and social aggression as well as indirect acts such as spreading rumors and telling other people about the problem) (Underwood, 2003; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Bjorkqvist & Niemela, 1992). Literature on relational aggression has grouped all aggressive behaviors together, from eye-rolling and spreading gossip to violent attacks and homicide (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Chesney-Lind & Irwin, 2008). Archer and Coyne (2005) argue that individuals use indirect aggression when the costs of direct aggression are too high, and that indirect aggression is designed to exclude or harm the social status of the victim. They conclude that all three terms can be used synonymously, although the field would benefit from either choosing one for the sake of consistency or to discern the subtle and important differences between them. Relational aggression can lead to serious

externalizing and internalizing behavior, including eating disorders, depression, self-injury, and suicide.

*Emotional consequences of relational aggression*

Research has not shown the same negative outcomes for victims and perpetrators of relational aggression as it has for chronic offenders (Chesney-Lind & Irwin, 2008) although this may be because girls who engage in relational aggression move in and out of the roles of victim, perpetrator, and bystander much more fluidly than do children and adolescence with chronic conduct behaviors (Schrader & Matthews, 2008; Chesney-Lind & Irwin, 2008). Furthermore, relational aggression may be a part of normal, prosocial development—adolescents who engage in relational aggression have higher social cognition and are more central in peer groups (Xie et al., 2002). Archer and Coyne (2005) note that other species do not engage in indirect aggression—it is a social behavior that requires advanced social skills and metacognitive abilities. Finally, Chesney-Lind and Irwin (2008) argue that relational aggression does not lead to physical aggression. While physical aggression increases an adolescent’s risk of dropping out of school and arrest, relational aggression predicted none of these negative outcomes (Xie et al., 2002).

However, victims of relational aggression are more prone to depression and to self-harming coping strategies, including alcohol use, self-injuring, and suicide. Girls who are victims of relational aggression also report anxiety and depression, and being a victim of relational aggression can predict later social maladjustment (Archer & Coyne, 2005). Girls report being hurt and distressed by relational aggression (Crick, 1995; Galen & Underwood, 1997) and negative outcomes include “peer rejection,

depression, isolation, and loneliness” (Chesney-Lind & Irwin, 2008, p. 112). Girls who have been extremely victimized may self-harm or commit suicide. There are many cases in the recent news that illustrates these extreme emotional consequences. The case of Megan Meier, a fifteen-year-old girl victimized by her friend’s mother who hanged herself in 2007 in one example of a victim of relational aggression. Amanda Todd, who killed herself after years of tormenting by her peers in 2012, is another, and demonstrates the important role of bystanders as contributing to, or not alleviating, the emotional consequences that occur due to this aggression. Retaeah Parsons killed herself in 2013, and Daisy Coleman attempted suicide after alleged sexual assault and harassment. As discussed above, shame and embarrassment can lead to isolation from the social group and, as Tangney et al. (2007) point out, can lead to self-condemnation and negative consequences.

Victims are not the only ones experiencing potential emotional effects of relational aggression. While aggressors may also experience exclusion from their social group, and thus feel isolated, more likely they are experiencing positive emotional effects, as they are more likely to be perceived as popular, experience less loneliness, and have higher social rank than girls who do not aggress (Archer & Coyne, 2005). Archer and Coyne (2005) suggest that the most adept relational aggressors, who do not attract negative attention, experience positive social effects of aggressing, whereas girls who use more direct aggression strategies are perceived as mean and will be rejected by the peer group they are attempting to manipulate. It is clear that victims experience negative emotional effects. What is not clear in the literature is how bullies experience emotions, particularly emotions across the four

emotion families as defined by Haidt (2003). In the few studies that consider the emotions of bullies, disengagement is counted as an absence of moral emotion (Crick & Dodge, 1994). Are all four of these families evidenced in all of the roles in which girls participate in relational aggression? If so, what moderates the relationship between affect and rationality—what is affecting and motivating the decision to act, and in what ways?

### ***Summary of the Literature***

In sum, the literature states that emotions do play a role in moral decision-making. While rationalists argue that cognition drives action, the social intuitionist models look at intuition as driving moral justifications of action decisions. However, both models have left room for deliberative reasoning, and neither model has especially well articulated the non-moral factors and motivations that may affect action. Haidt (2003) has outlined moral emotions that relate to each other in various ways, organized into four families and has suggested actions that may be elicited by each emotion. However, the empirical literature surrounding those families does not clearly illustrate strong relationships between certain moral emotions and certain actions, and this again raises the question of what other factors may be mediating this relationship, such as the considerations raised in the social-information processing model, social-cultural factors, and emotional and social intelligence. For example, an individual with a high level of emotional awareness and intelligence may manipulate the social group and engage in prosocial aggression in order to advance her own position within the social group, acting without moral consideration. This literature review examined the inter-relationship between cognition and affect, especially



looking at how various theorists have conceptualized this relationship in models of moral judgment and moral action. Various emotions involved in relational aggression were then described and related back to relational aggression as a moral problem. What the literature fails to demonstrate in an in-depth way is how it is that adolescent girls use affect and cognition in the context of relational aggression, and especially, how moral emotions as currently conceptualized in the moral psychology literature are evidenced in these real-life emotionally laden situations.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODS**

Based upon both current news items and academic literature, girls experience strong emotions when faced with relational aggression. An analysis of in-depth qualitative interview data can serve to articulate what emotions girls experience, how they describe those emotions, how these emotions change over time, and how these emotions are connected to action choices. This dissertation conducts this analysis in two ways: through coding of specific statements that use emotion in a sample of girls as they move from grades five through seven, and through an in depth case analysis of two participants in that data set. Given that no such analyses have been published on such data longitudinally and in such depth, this exploratory study sheds further light on emotional experiences and transformations that occur over time in the very vulnerable years in adolescent girls' lives.

#### ***Assumptions***

This work assumes a constructive cognitive developmental approach to moral psychology (Piaget, 1932; Kohlberg, 1984; Kegan, 1982; 1994). Within these models, the individual is the epistemic knowing agent, whereas in sociocultural theories the social context itself predominates the construction of individual psychology (Vygotsky, 1987; Lave, 1991; Rogoff & Lave, 1984; Rogoff, 1990). Although there are alternative explanations of how moral psychology develops, the assumptions taken here are that the individual can reflect on how they make meaning on their experiences.

Individual psychology and development can be ascertained through

discussions and interactions with research participants and through probing their thinking through an interrogative (following Piaget's early example, and continuing into narrative psychology) to understand the underlying meaning making framework behind moral decision-making (see more discussion about this below). The feminist research approach likewise emphasizes the phenomenological and narrative voice (Haste, 1990; Brown, 2003). While some critics (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan & Brown, 1997; Belenky et al., 1992) argue that Kohlberg's work does not account for the experiences of girls and women, it is problematic to reject his theoretical work based on gender essentialism, because his theoretical and methodological approach does not violate many assumptions of more feminist approaches to research, such as Charmaz's (2006) constructed grounded theory. Both research enterprises allow the participants in the study to be the experts and contribute the dilemmas with which they identify and to which they are connected.

The study of girls' and women's development have been important in shaping a fuller understanding of psychology (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Belenky *et al.*, 1986; Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Galen & Underwood, 1997; Greene, 2003; Garbarino, 2006; Schrader, 2005; Chesney-Lind & Irwin, 2008; Rayner, Schniering, Rapee, Taylor, & Hutchinson, 2014; Zimmer-Gembeck, Pronk, Goodwin, Mastro & Crick, 2013) but comparatively few single-sex samples exist that look deeply at how girls understand their own social and emotional development. However, there are studies that examine gender differences, and some have found none (Eisenberg, 2000; Mathieson & Banerjee, 2011; Decety, Michalska & Kinzler, 2012; Malti, Killen & Gasser, 2012; Malti & Krettenauer, 2012).

Because we explore moral emotions and relational aggression and trying to see patterns of development, hypothesis testing is not an appropriate methodology.

Instead, the in-depth conversation with participants (DeVault & Gross, 2007) will allow a deep understanding of adolescent girls' voices and emotions, and capture both how girls understand their emotions and the contexts in which these emotions occur.

By collaborating on a multi-year, longitudinal study looking at girls' relational aggression (Schrader, 2005-current, entitled the adolescent Girls Relational Aggression Longitudinal Study, or GRLS), my research partners and I hope to ameliorate that situation. This dissertation, as a subset of the larger study, will inform our work and contribute directly to the larger literature on adolescent girls and social aggression. This analysis of the GRLS data, then, the focus will be on how girls express moral emotions when discussing their interactions with others, and how these reflections on these emotions affect how girls act and react in their conflicts.

### ***Research Questions***

“By asking another person for the stories of their relational lives, we can understand something of how they construct relationships—what aspects of other people capture their attention and imagination, what they seek from others, and what impels them to maintain relationships and what leads them to abandon them” (Josselson, 2007, p. 23). This seems to be at the heart of relational aggression, and it is that understanding, of girls and women's development over time, that influences this work.

To this end, this dissertation addresses the following research questions:

*1. Do girls express (moral) emotions in RA situations? If so, what emotions are expressed?*

This question is analyzed by identifying what emotions girls mention when dealing with relational aggression, in both real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. While the hypothetical dilemmas were constructed to encourage participants to think through moral problems, participants will provide their own real-life dilemmas, which may emphasize both moral and non-moral considerations and emotions. However, specific emotions were not prompted in the interview questions.

*2. What is the individual psychology of emotions for girls in relational aggression situations? How does this psychology change over time? That is, do girls have and maintain an emotional “constellation” that is consistent across all situations of relational aggression, or is there a constellation of emotions that is more fluid throughout the years?*

This question is addressed by assessing which emotions are used by individuals at least 15% of the codes both within and across all four years of the study. In the results section, criteria are described that have been developed to determine an emotional constellation, which could be presence/absence or on predominance of use. This is dependent on results of coding.

*3. How do girls evidence their awareness of their emotions and how does that relate to emotional regulation?*

Using ATLAS.ti it is possible to look at co-occurrences of emotion and emotional regulation codes, and specifically at what emotions are related to what other emotions. A co-occurrence is defined as when one code occurs within the same quote

as another code and suggests a relationship between the two codes. These analyses are supplemented with examples from the data to give a sense of the constellation of emotions that girls experience.

*4. How do moral emotions affect action choices girls make in RA situations?*

Examining the co-occurrences between action and emotion over time, can lead to better understanding if and how the dual process of moral reasoning appears in adolescent girls' experiences of RA. Moreover, analyzing these relationships may offer more clarity about the relationship between emotions and actions.

*5. What is the relationship between motivations and actions?*

Again, using co-occurrence between motivation and action codes it is possible to see how emotions might motivate particular actions in situations of relational aggression. Understanding this relationship may provide more clarity on how girls choose to act within these situations.

All research questions were addressed by coding the subsections of the interview (listed in Appendix A) for all longitudinal participants in the four years under study as described in Chapter 3, using the coding manual in Appendix C. These subsections of the interview were selected because they asked participants to think about their emotions and actions and also allowed them to relate stories from their own experiences.

***Data Sources and Participants***

This dissertation analyzes data collected from the Girls Relational Aggression Longitudinal Study (GRLS) (Schrader, 2005-current). That project examines relational aggression and the self, moral, and interpersonal, metacognitive, and emotional

development of adolescent girls. That study frames relational aggression in constructive-developmental and moral terms and is one of the few qualitative, longitudinal studies of relational aggression in adolescent girls (c.f., Owens, Shute, & Slee, 2000). The project was designed to develop an in-depth understanding of relational aggression, and a better understanding of why some girls “stand strong” and defend victims of relational aggression and how we can encourage all girls to do so (Schrader, 2005). The project was designed to capture girls’ voices and their own meaning making as they shared their thoughts and experiences about relational aggression. In contrast to other studies of relational aggression that use surveys and questionnaires (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Bjorkqvist & Niemela, 1992), this work takes the viewpoint of girls being ‘the experts’ on the definition and thought processes involved in understanding relational aggression as a moral, personal, and interpersonal problem, rather than it being defined by the researchers (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 1998; Brown & Gilligan, 2003). Further, by having a sample consisting of girls who were not peer-nominated or nominated due to their roles as victims or bullies, this project attempts to obtain responses from those who might represent a girl anyone would interact with on a typical day. Although the sample is a volunteer and not a random sample, the data shed light onto how girls, not necessarily identified as bullies or victims, experience everyday relational aggression.

*Participants in Schrader’s Girls Longitudinal Study (GRLS)*

Participants were recruited from schools in the same school district in a mixed suburban and rural area in upstate New York. Girls were recruited by being invited to an assembly in their own school, during the school day. Female graduate student

research assistants explained the study and its goals and the structure. Each fifth grade girl was given an assent form and a parental consent form. Each girls filled out the assent form, which included the option “No, I don’t want to participate,” so that girls could not tell who was, and who was not, planning on participating in the study. Girls who did want to participate in the study provided contact information, and were later contacted though their school and provided a parental consent form, which students returned to their teacher. . After girls were recruited and assent and parental consent was obtained, girls were interviewed during the school day by one member of the research team, and given a small gift for participation in each interview.

Those who assented to participate in the study were primarily white, middle-class students. The final sample lacks racial diversity, due to self-selected participation. Attempts to redress this problem failed and should be the topic for later exploration as to why predominantly white, middle-class girls participated, as well as what other differences might be seen in a more diverse sample.

Participants for this analysis are the fifth-grade sample who persisted over the four years of the study, with the exception of 4 students who were included in the analysis but who did not have complete interviews in year 4. Thus, this analysis consists of 15 participants in years one through three, but in year four, there were 11 participants.

### ***Interviews***

Interviews are widely used within the cognitive-developmental approach (Kohlberg, 1984) as well as within feminist psychology (Gilligan, 1982; Belenky, et al., 1986; Brown & Gilligan, 1992). Krathwohl (1998) notes that qualitative



procedures for collecting data (such as interviewing) emphasize description and explanation over validation. Charmaz (2006) argues that interviewing allows for deep understanding of a topic of which an interviewee has extensive knowledge. Thus, in studying such a covert topic as relational aggression, asking girls to become the experts and share their knowledge allows for a deeper understanding of a phenomenon. Moreover, using interview data as a part of a grounded theory approach allows for theories to emerge from the data. While these resultant theories may initially be applicable to only a small set of participants, the processes observed within this group can then be tested with other individuals going through similar experiences (Charmaz, 2006). This argument builds off the original approach to grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) while allowing for more insight to come from both theoretical frameworks and from the coding and the re-coding of the data (Charmaz, 2006).

The overall interview (Appendix B) was conducted over three or four sessions, depending on the year of the study. In year one, there were three interviews, and in subsequent years, there were four. Each interview took 30-45 minutes and was conducted in a private space in school, and audio recorded. All interviews took place at the participants' school during free periods or elective classes. In year one, there were three separate interview times. The first interview asked girls to look at models of relational aggression and discuss the different roles that they had witnessed and also asked girls to reflect on what they thought caused relational aggression. This interview concluded with one part of the Subject-Object Interview (Kegan, 1982), which asked girls to reflect on a time when they had been angry, sad, torn, or proud with other girls

(in year 2, sixth grade, this emotion was limited to “torn”). Interview two began with a Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987) focused around conflict between two sisters. Participants then completed a Moral Metacognition Interview (Schrader, 1988) to assess how metacognitively aware participants were, and a real life interview question adapted from Gilligan, 1988. The third interview consisted of the Relational Aggression Interview, designed by Schrader (2005) and focusing around a hypothetical dilemma between friends and how that dilemma might make the characters and the participants feel. In year two, a fourth interview was added with the goal of getting at how participants defined themselves apart from (or as a part of) the social group, as well as their sense of the changes that occurred since the previous year. That interview became the first set of questions in years two through 4 of the study. In the fourth year, an addition to the RAI was added in which girls picked from a list of options written from different socio-moral perspectives in terms of their action choice and underlying reasons for it. This addition is at the end of interview four in the interview protocol. See Appendix B for all interview schedules for all four years.

While all interviewers followed the same interview guide, each interviewer also asked follow-up questions as appropriate. Participants were encouraged to share open-ended stories and to elaborate and could ask clarifying questions about the interview prompts. At each interview, participants were given snacks and small gifts to thank them for participating. Interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim by an external consultant. A sub-sample of transcripts was reviewed for transcription accuracy. Only participants who had parts of the overall interview in a given year, or may have missed one sub-interview in a year, were included in this

analysis. Participants who missed more than one interview were not included in the study. In year 4 (eighth grade), participants 1, 7, 11, and 16 did not continue in the study, but were included in the first three years of analysis for this dissertation since there were important longitudinal contributions that could be made.

This analysis focuses on segments of the full interview, which is detailed in Appendix A. The full interviews for each year are found in Appendix B.

### ***Coding Procedure: Approach and Methodological Grounding***

Consistent with qualitative data methodology, interviews are analyzed in “chunks” of data. For example, Frimer and Walker (2009) completed a study analyzing how individuals conceptualize values associated with moral identity in narrative. In analyzing their data, they used interview “chunks,” or explanation data segments that were connected to one of the values being considered in the study. These chunks are also called ‘units of analysis’ in other studies. Expanding the analysis to include context allows for a deeper understanding and goes beyond a linguistic analysis (Charmaz, 2006). The coding of the data for this analysis follows a similar procedure, considering components of the narrative surrounding either the use of an emotion word or an experience in which a girl is speaking about her feelings or the feelings of others. Additionally, the same chunk of data could be coded for multiple emotions/emotion families if it fits those criteria, again similar to Frimer & Walker (2009).

The research questions mentioned above were addressed by analyzing parts of the GRLS interview data. The parts of each interview that were coded for this current analyses are: questions related to being “torn” or other emotion abstracted from

Kegan's Subject-Object interview, questions focusing on how the participant views her self, questions around being a bystander, questions about emotional reflection and resilience, Real Life Dilemma questions based on Gilligan (1982), and parts of the Relational Aggression Interview. These parts of the interview that were analyzed are highlighted in Appendix A.

### *Coding procedure*

The results reported in the next chapter are based on the analysis of the data, using a coding procedure that is described next. Specifically, a coding manual was developed using Haidt's conceptualizations of moral emotions (2003) as well as grounded theory approach, which allowed codes to emerge from the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Creswell, 1998; Charmaz, 2006). This follows a constructed grounded theory approach rather than a true grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006). Development of the coding manual is explained below. While Haidt's (2003) list of emotions, and the families into which they are grouped, captured part of the girls' experiences, it was important to stay open to other emotions that might arise.

Motivations for acting as well as the emotional processes mediating the action/emotion process were sought. Following the process outlined by Corbin & Strauss (1990) and Charmaz (2006), I developed categories (open coding), looked to see how these categories were interconnected (axial coding), and then connected the codes to develop a story (selective coding) (Creswell, 1998). Doing so allows for theory building around how girls experience and process relational aggression and moreover how it affects their larger social circle (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Creswell, 1998; Brown & Gilligan, 2003; Charmaz, 2006).

In order to manage the analysis of this large data set, ATLAS.ti qualitative data analysis software was used. After the longitudinal data set was loaded into ATLAS.ti into one Hermeneutic Unit, the data were coded for anger and guilt. Because the analysis is interested in how it is that girls understand and use emotions, it was necessary to do a qualitative analysis of each of the emotions that were found in the data set. Starting with the eight emotions listed in Haidt (2003), I then expanded those categories, both by breaking emotions such as anger and guilt into subtypes based on how participants were using them within the data and by including emotions not considered by Haidt (2003). While my initial focus was only on Haidt's (2003) moral emotions, I made the decision to include other, non-moral, emotions to get an understanding on how emotions might affect situations of relational aggression.

#### *Developing emotion codes*

Definitions of emotions were created both from Haidt (2003), following the practice of attending to theoretical sensitivity when conducting grounded theory analysis (Glaser, 1978; Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Using the categories "emotional awareness, monitoring means that girls are monitoring their own and others' emotions, which distinguishes it from paralyzing, in which awareness of others' emotions leads to paralysis and inability to act. I then used open coding to create codes for actions, motivations, and emotional awareness, and to better refine the emotion codes. The coding manual categorizes these codes and makes them more particular to the problem and the population under study (Brown & Gilligan, 1991; Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Brown, 1997).

Based upon iterative analyses, both *anger* and *guilt* were divided into several individual codes that specifically captured different ways in which girls were experiencing these emotions. An initial attempt was made to autocode all of Haidt's (2003) emotions; however, this was not possible because the girls did not use the actual emotional words used by Haidt (2003). For example, girls did not use the word *contempt* even when treating others in that manner, and they never speak about disgust (and *disgust* is not coded within the data set). It thus became clear that doing a qualitative analysis by open coding in ATLAS.ti was necessary and consistent with the literature on both constructed grounded theory and narrative discourse and interpretation. Therefore, instead of looking simply at emotion words, a deeper understanding of how emotions were utilized in girls' narrative is possible (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Creswell, 1998; Brown & Gilligan, 2003; Charmaz, 2006).

#### *Developing action codes*

These codes solely emerged from the data; while Haidt (2003) discusses various action tendencies attached to moral emotions, he does not specify what those actions might be. I coded *confront* when a participant spoke to someone directly about her behavior, typically on behalf of oneself (rather than on behalf of a victimized other; when that sort of conflict occurred, I coded it as *upstand*). The theme *disengaged* was used when a participant walked away from a situation. I used *engage in another behavior* when a participant did something else when upset with someone. This could be either productive (talking to a friend, playing with a dog) or destructive (eating too much). I developed the code *forget* for when participants spoke about forgetting a situation or "letting it go." *Ignore* and *isolate* were used as codes when

participants simply ignored a situation rather than get involved and when a victim was isolated from the social group. Participants would *redirect the group* when they managed to get the group to do something else besides pick on a victim. When an instrumental reason was expressed (a participant would say that she was upstanding only to maintain the friendship), I used the code *upstand in order to maintain the friendship*. The final two action codes were *perspective taking* and *groupthink*. *Perspective taking* was coded when participants looked at the situation from multiple points of view. The code of *groupthink* represented when the social group was acting as one and when bad behavior was excused because it was what the entire group thought was right. Providing “constructive criticism” to one member of the group was often excused because the entire group thought that the victim was annoying or could dress better.

The action codes developed ranged from actively getting involved, actively not getting involved, or passively standing by. The observation of these themes of action led me to question why girls might (or might not) get involved in situations of relational aggression, in the same way that reading how girls controlled their emotions made me wonder about how emotional awareness might fit into their experiences. Thus, I developed my final two categories of codes: emotional awareness and motivations for (not) getting involved.

#### *Developing emotional awareness codes*

While looking at emotions and planning to code for actions, I realized that including emotional awareness and motivations would allow for a more accurate representation of how emotions are experienced and how they affect action choices in

this sample. Contextualizing moral emotions, reasoning, and actions allows for a deeper understanding of how girls use this information to make action choices and how these action choices affect their relationships.

All emotional awareness codes emerged from the data, and specifically focus on how participants think about their emotions and their experiences and how they control those emotions. These codes are built on theoretical work by Schrader (1988, 2008) and others, who argue that awareness around cognitive states can lead to advancements in processing and growth in developmental stage. Schrader (1988) considers how metacognitive awareness of moral dilemmas might lead to changes in stage in moral judgment. In other words, awareness can lead to growth and changes in thinking, which is an assertion echoed by Haidt (2001) when discussing moral intuitions. This is also a facet of the dual-process model (Kahneman, 2003), namely that the more aware we are of our cognitive and emotional states, the more this awareness can change our thinking and reactions. Furthermore, if, as Zeman and Shipman (1997) suggest, emotions and regulation of emotions can be seen as tools of interpersonal communication, looking at both the emotions and the awareness surrounding those emotions could lead to a better understanding of relational aggression.

The first code developed in this category was *emotional awareness monitoring*, which is simply being aware of your own or others' emotions. This code is distinguished from *perspective taking*, which is when a participant speaks about how her perspective might vary from the perspective of another, whereas monitoring may apply only to the self. However, *emotional awareness monitoring* and *perspective*



*taking* often co-occur, and I would argue that monitoring is essential for perspective taking to occur. *Paralyzing* is when this awareness of emotions leads to an inability to act. *Reflection* is when someone reflects on her emotions. *Self-control* was used when participants controlled emotions and thus changed behavior. For example, a participant might feel angry, but rather than lashing out, she might quietly calm herself down. Frequently this code occurred with the action code *disengage*, when participants removed themselves from situations in order to calm themselves down. The final emotional awareness code was *emotional downregulation*, in which a participant would calm down the intensity of an emotion. These codes were useful to understand how participants approached their emotions, but they also overlapped frequently because of the variety of strategies that participants used.

This category was developed to better elucidate the relationship between emotions and actions, and specifically in the sense that understanding how girls are aware of their emotions and how they manipulate them has important implications for understanding their actions. The data that needed to be analyzed were any motivations that could be found behind the actions that girls were taking.

#### *Developing motivations for (not) getting involved codes*

The final set of codes developed were motivations for (not) getting involved. The first of these was *absolve self of responsibility*, which was coded when participants mentioned that they took the stance that they “could not to anything” to stop the meanness and mentioned it as a justification as to why they had no reason to get involved. Another motivation code was *maintain friendships*. Participants referred to their friendships and explicitly connected their choices to get involved to how it

would affect their standing within their friendship groups. Participants also discussed things being *not fair*, using this exact phrase. *Power (lack of compassion for others)* was coded when a bully was perceived as aggressing because she liked to have power and did not care what others thought. *Strong sense of self* was another motivation code; girls who expressed that they liked who they were and had a sense of who they were coded using this code. Like *maintain friendships, torn between self and others* was a reason that participants did not upstand on behalf of their friends. This code was also used when participants expressed ambivalence about doing what they wanted and doing what they thought would be acceptable for the group. Often along with *groupthink* was the code *the victim deserves it*, which is the belief that a victim deserves to be bullied because of her own actions. This was only coded when expressed explicitly by participants.

In summary, a series of codes were developed that fit broadly into four categories: emotion, action, emotional awareness, and motivations for (not) getting involved (see Appendix C for the full coding manual). The following table summarizes the four categories and the codes that emerged within them:

Emotions	Moral anger, anger, anger as a reaction (offensive), anger as a reaction (defensive), anger as a consequence, anger leads to isolation from the social group, reflection on anger within the social group, anger as paralyzing, anger as a catalyst, contempt, shame, embarrassment, guilt, guilt as a catalyst to act, guilt consequence, guilt external, guilt internal, guilt transition torn, guilt undefined, compassion, positive upstanding emotion, feel bad/feel sad, disappointed, awkward, jealous, disgust, gratitude
Actions	Confront, disengage, engage in another behavior, forget, forgive, ignore, isolate, redirect group, upstand, upstand in order to maintain the friendship, perspective-taking, group think
Emotional Awareness	Monitoring, paralyzing, reflection, self-control, emotional downregulation
Motivations for (not) Getting Involved	Absolve self of responsibility, maintain friendships, not fair, power (lack of compassion for others) strong sense of self, torn between self and others, victim deserves it

### *Coding reliability*

In order to establish reliability in the coding, an undergraduate research assistant was given the coding manual developed using the process outlined above. The coding manual was developed using the subsections of the interview outlined in Appendix A.

After becoming familiar with the coding manual and having the opportunity to ask questions, the research assistant coded the four cases from which examples in the manual were taken. Although there may be a conflict because manual's examples were taken from the cases that the research assistant coded, it was important to use those

cases because they were from among the most complete data set. Inter-rater reliability checks were done only on the parts of the interview data that were analyzed for this analysis. That is, the entire interview for the participants was not analyzed, but only the subset of the interviews that were included in the present analysis. Any disparities in coding were resolved via conversation (Brown, 1997; Brown & Gilligan, 2003). Interrater reliability had to be calculated via conversation and comparing of documents (rather than an ATLAS.ti calculation) because of differences in the excerpts used by the undergraduate to code.<sup>ii</sup> Approximately 85% of codes matched on the first comparison, and other codes were reconciled through discussion and the final decision on the coding was mediated through conversation between the undergraduate assistant and me.

The most frequent coding conflicts arose when the undergraduate rater coded something that the question asked the participant to do (for example, if the question prompted the participant to take another person's perspective, that was not coded as *perspective taking*, whereas a spontaneous discussion of multiple perspectives would be coded).

### ***Summary of the Methods***

The following Results chapter addresses each research question.. First is an examination of whether and which emotions were present in the data (question 1), and then how the use of emotions changed over time (question 2). Next is an exploration of emotional awareness, motivations, and actions, and how each of these codes co-occur with the emotion codes (questions 3-5).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

Using the coding manual developed for this study of moral emotions in relational aggression situations in portions of the interviews in the Girls Relational Aggression Longitudinal Study, the following questions were addressed, as stated in the Methods chapter:

- 1: Do girls express moral emotions in RA situations? If so, what emotions are expressed?*
- 2: What is the individual psychology of emotions for girls in relational aggression situations? How does this psychology change over time? That is, do girls have and maintain an emotional “constellation” that is consistent across all situations of relational aggression, or is there a constellation of emotions that is more fluid throughout the years?*
- 3: How do girls report their awareness of their emotions and how do they evidence emotional regulation?*
- 4: How do moral emotions affect action choices girls make in RA situations?*
- 5: What is the relationship between motivations and actions?*

Additionally, an in-depth case study of two participants serves to illustrate the contexts in which participants reported experiencing the emotions and making action choices. Emotion codes appear in *italics* throughout the remainder of the Results and Discussion chapters.

***Do girls express moral emotions in RA situations? If so, what emotions are expressed?***

This question was addressed by applying the coding manual developed, as described in Chapter 3. All data for all girls over all four years was combined in these results, then separated by year, in order to get both a comprehensive picture of emotions in relational aggression as well as a developmental sense emotional changes over time.

***Combined results***

Over all four years, the twenty-eight emotion codes were used by all girls combined, across all four years, a total of 168 times.

I developed several codes from the data to capture the emotions about which girls were speaking, in addition to coding for the codes from Haidt (2003). The emotion codes used were:

Table 2: Emotion Codes

Emotions	Moral anger, anger, anger as a reaction (offensive), anger as a reaction (defensive), anger as a consequence, anger leads to isolation from the social group, reflection on anger within the social group, anger as paralyzing, anger as a catalyst, contempt, shame, embarrassment, guilt, guilt as a catalyst to act, guilt consequence, guilt external, guilt internal, guilt transition torn, guilt undefined, compassion, positive upstanding emotion, feel bad/feel sad, disappointed, awkward, jealous, disgust, gratitude
----------	---

As seen in Table 2 above, girls used 28 emotion codes across all 4 years. Twenty of those codes emerged from the data using the grounded theory approach described in Chapter 3 rather than from using Haidt's description of emotion families. Most of the emergent as well as the 8 extant theory-based codes belong to what Haidt (2003) calls

the “other-condemning family,” and represent the many types of anger expressed by the girls. (Recall, Haidt’s eight were anger, shame, embarrassment, guilt, compassion, DAAD, gratitude, and elevation.) While these codes could have been compressed into *moral and non-moral anger* (moral anger being triggered by injustice or harm done to someone else and non-moral anger being triggered by other reasons), I kept the nine distinct anger codes to show the spectrum of the emotions that girls experience. For the same reason, *guilt* is differentiated into seven different types.

The following sections of the chapter describe each of the codes with *emotion* in the coding manual and present the results from analysis of the data using the coding manual.

#### *Other-condemning*

The code *moral anger* comes from Haidt’s identification of emotion families (2003) and is a perceived violation of rights of fairness. It is triggered when the rights of a third party are violated. This is the only type of anger that can be considered truly moral, as it is elicited by a rights violation and concerns others. All other types of anger involve the self, and in the case of anger as a reaction (offensive), it can be outright aggression toward others.

*Anger* was used as a code when participants spoke about being “mad” or “angry” without specifying why they were angry. *Anger as a reaction (offensive)* was used when participants spoke about lashing out toward others, most typically when participants spoke about someone “being mean” to someone else. *Anger as a reaction (defensive)* was used when participants were avoiding others’ anger. *Anger as a consequence* was used when participants were speaking about how acting might cause

someone to get mad at you. *Anger leads to isolation from the social group* and *reflection on anger within the social group* are both self-explanatory—the former refers to when someone’s anger leads another to be isolated, and the latter refers to when someone reflects on how anger shapes the group. *Reflection on anger within the social group* is one of the most prevalent types of emotions, as girls seem to be reporting indications of constantly thinking about how other people’s anger causes problems or thinking about how to suppress their own anger in order to avoid conflicts. *Anger as paralyzing* is coded when perceiving anger leads to a participant’s feeling unsure what to do, and *anger as a catalyst* is coded when anger causes a participant to act, reflect, change, or take another person’s perspective.

As discussed below, one of the significant findings of the study is how anger both affects girls daily and how it changes over time. In seventh grade in particular, girls have stopped expressing compassion, their perspective taking has decreased, and they speak much more about anger, especially *anger as a reaction (offensive)*.

Unlike anger, *contempt* appears infrequently within the data, which contradicts some bullying literature that suggests that aggressors can aggress because they lack critical ability to empathize with others. The code *contempt* is taken from Haidt (2003) and refers to a “cool indifference, a statement that the other is not even worthy of strong feelings such as anger” (p. 858). The last emotion in the other-condemning family is *disgust*, which girls do not express in the data. Haidt (2003) also speaks about disgust, which he connects to violations of physical purity. Unlike Haidt’s recent research in political perspectives and moral emotions, disgust does not seem to



motivate relational aggression within this data set. The evolution toward disgust motivating condemnation and isolation could be an interesting topic of future study.

The last other-condemning code that emerged from the data was *jealous*. Girls spoke not about their own jealousy, but instead they argued that being jealous could cause someone to start a conflict. Jealousy fits into the other-condemning category because of its close relationship to anger within the data. Often, when girls are perceived as being jealous, they are also perceived as lashing out in aggressive ways. Further study on how jealousy might motivate relational aggression could be interesting, as girls who are jealous might use relational aggression strategies in order to shift the balance of power within the social group.

#### *Self-conscious*

Haidt (2003) places *shame* and *embarrassment*, in the self-conscious family, arguing that *shame* reflects on a failure of the true self, whereas *embarrassment* is a failure of action and thus not as connected to the self. In these data, both emotions appear, although they tend to be coded together to reflect the fact that girls tend to experience something closer to shame when they speak about feeling embarrassed. Haidt (2003) argues that shame and embarrassment in non-western, more interdependent cultures, tend to be expressed in very similar ways. Adolescent girls tend to be very interdependent, and thus, in this data, girls tend to use the word “embarrass” to express an emotion much closer to “shame,” seen as a failure of the self.

The self-conscious family also includes guilt, which Haidt (2003) defines as “the violation of moral rules and imperatives...triggered most powerfully if one’s

harmful action also creates a threat to one's communion with or relatedness to the victim" (p. 861). Haidt (2003) further argues that embarrassment, shame, and guilt uphold the social order. When I began open coding, however, I divided *guilt* into several sub-categories that better reflected how girls were speaking about and experiencing the emotion. Many of these categories were parallel to the anger categories; for example, *guilt as a catalyst* to act was used when participants were connecting feelings of guilt to action choices in an explicit way. *Guilt as a consequence* was coded when participants spoke about guilt as a consequence. Unlike anger, further guilt sub-categories were connected to various understandings of self (this make sense, as anger is an other-condemning emotion, whereas guilt is a self-conscious emotion). *Guilt external* referred to participants' feeling guilty because of external pressures, whereas *guilt internal* refers to guilt caused by violation of internalized principles of right and wrong. *Guilt transition torn* is similar to the code anger as paralyzing—participants feel torn between what they know is right and expectations of the social group, and sometimes they cannot decide what to do. *Guilt undefined* was used when girls felt guilty but did not specify why. I also used this code when girls spoke about "feeling bad" because of what they did (or did not) do. While I expected guilt to motivate moral action such as upstanding, it did not. Guilt certainly appeared in the data, but compared to anger, it did not motivate action nor did girls use it frequently when discussing how they felt. However, guilt did appear more frequently when girls were expressing others' emotional states.

In addition to the self-conscious codes discussed by Haidt (2003), I also added codes that emerged from the data that seemed to fit into this family. These codes

included *feel bad/feel sad* and *awkward*. Girls spoke about victims' feeling bad or sad when isolated by others. They were often able to imagine that the victims of relational aggression felt bad or sad, even when they did not use that knowledge to intervene. *Awkward* was another code that emerged from the data and was most commonly used when discussing intervention—specifically, that intervening on behalf of another person would be awkward, so it's often better not to get involved.

#### *Other-suffering*

Rather than discussing empathy, Haidt (2003) instead discusses *compassion* as a prototypical moral emotion within the other–suffering family. Haidt (2003) says that experiencing compassion “makes people want to help, comfort, or otherwise alleviate the suffering of the other” (p. 862). *Compassion* appears more frequently in the early grades of the study, but by seventh grade, girls are speaking less about feeling compassion for others. Instead, they try to disengage from conflicts or get stuck in their own anger patterns.

#### *Other-praising*

As a part of his final family, other-praising, Haidt (2003) discusses what he calls *awe and elevation*, which he defines in part as causing “a desire to become a better person oneself” (p. 864). He also connects this emotion to religious transcendence and seeing the better side of humanity. I defined a weak version of this emotion as *positive upstanding emotion*, which is the warmth and happiness that a participant felt after sticking up for a friend or getting involved in a situation of bullying. Throughout all four grades, girls acknowledge that when they stand up for someone, or if they did stand up for someone, they feel good about that experience.

Like some of the other positive emotions, this drops off in seventh grade, with the growth of anger and disengagement from the larger community. Haidt (2003) also speaks about *gratitude* as a moral emotion, in which someone feels “warm and friendly toward a benefactor” (p. 863). *Gratitude* appears occasionally in the data, but participants express a mixed relationship toward the emotion. Some of them say that while a victim may feel gratitude toward someone getting involved in a situation of aggression, the victim may also feel shame or sadness that someone else had to get involved.

In analyzing overall trends in emotions over all four years, emotions that were experienced by over 50% of the girls in a given year were considered as strong evidence of the use of that emotion, rather than its use simply being present. This criterion allowed comparison of trends over time as well as trends within years. The colors in the table below signify the following: in the emotion column, yellow is the other-condemning family, green is the self-conscious family, blue is the other praising family, and red is the other-suffering family. In the individual cells, light green signifies that over 50% of the participants are expressing that particular emotion. Dark green means that more than 50% of girls are expressing that emotion for the first time in these four years of the study, and pink means that less than 50% of the girls are using that emotion for the first time in these four years of the study. This would give some indication of emotional development: what develops over time, and when in the developmental trajectory a type of emotion is both prominent and develops.

Table 3: Participant Use of Emotion Code by Grade (in percent)

	Fifth Grade		Sixth Grade		Seventh Grade		Eighth Grade	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Anger (emotion)	10	0.67	12	0.80	9	0.60	6	0.55
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	8	0.53	12	0.80	9	0.60	5	0.45
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	8	0.53	10	0.67	12	0.80	5	0.45
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (emotion)	6	0.40	9	0.60	11	0.73	4	0.36
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (emotion)	13	0.87	12	0.80	15	1	9	0.82
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to	6	0.40	4	0.27	2	0.13	3	0.27
Anger leads to isolation from the social g	2	0.13	10	0.67	5	0.33	4	0.36
Contempt (emotion)	2	0.13	5	0.33	4	0.27	0	0
Disappointed (emotion)	4	0.27	2	0.13	3	0.2	1	0.09
Disgust (emotion)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	3	0.20	6	0.40	4	0.27	6	0.55
Jealous	1	0.07	6	0.40	4	0.27	1	0.08
Reflection on anger within the social grou	10	0.67	12	0.80	9	0.60	7	0.64
Awkward (emotion)	1	0.07	1	0.07	7	0.47	3	0.27
Embarrassment (emotion)	1	0.07	4	0.27	3	0.20	3	0.27
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	14	0.93	12	0.80	11	0.73	8	0.73
Guilt (emotion)	2	0.13	2	0.13	3	0.20	2	0.18
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	1	0.07	5	0.33	2	0.13	1	0.09
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0.00	6	0.40	7	0.47	5	0.45
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0.00	2	0.13	1	0.07	0	0
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0.00	6	0.40	3	0.20	5	0.45
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	2	0.13	3	0.20	4	0.27	3	0.27
Guilt undefined (emotion)	7	0.47	11	0.73	9	0.60	3	0.27
Shame (emotion)	2	0.13	5	0.33	4	0.27	4	0.36
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	7	0.47	11	0.73	8	0.53	7	0.64
Gratitude (emotion)	1	0.07	1	0.07	1	0.07	0	0
Compassion (emotion)	9	0.60	11	0.73	11	0.73	5	0.42

Looking at changes in emotions over the four grades, it appears that any emotion used in fifth grade persists across all four years of the study. In fifth grade, the fewest number of participants who expressed a particular emotion was 0 and the most was 14. In fifth grade, over 50% of the girls used *anger*, *anger as a catalyst*, *anger as a consequence*, *anger as a reaction (offensive)*, and *reflection on anger within the social group*. In addition, over 50% of the girls expressed *compassion* and *feel bad/feel sad*.

In sixth grade, the fewest number of participants who expressed a particular emotion was 0 and the highest was 12. In addition to the emotions expressed in fifth grade, more than 50% of the girls also expressed *anger as a reaction defensive* and *anger leads to isolation*. In short, by sixth grade, more girls expressed more types of anger. In sixth grade, *anger as a reaction (defensive)* and *anger leads to isolation from the social group* are used by more than 50% of participants for the first time, suggesting that girls are more aware that there are risks attached to anger and that they want to avoid those risks. In sixth grade, over 50% of the girls also express *guilt undefined* and *positive upstanding emotion*. The expression of *positive upstanding emotion* dovetails with an increase to 73% of the girls expressing *compassion*, which suggests that more awareness of and compassion toward the suffering of others might lead to more upstanding and good feelings about that upstanding. This possible relationship will be discussed more when looking at the relationships between actions and emotions.

By seventh grade, the fewest number of participants who expressed a particular

emotion was 0 and the most was 15. In seventh grade, all emotions used in sixth grade persisted, except *for anger leads to isolation*, which dropped to under 50% of girls using them. For the first time, 100% of participants discussed *anger as a reaction (offensive)*. Girls expressing feeling *awkward* rose from 6% in sixth grade to 46% in seventh grade, which suggests that girls have a heightened awareness that getting involved in other individuals' conflicts might lead to tension within the group. *Compassion* stayed at the same level as it was in sixth grade, but the increase in anger is important to note. In seventh grade, generalized *anger* dropped to 60% of girls' expressing it from 80% the year before, which could be related to girls' having better ways of noticing and expressing others' anger. *Anger as a catalyst* was used by about half the girls in fifth grade (53%), was used by 80% of girls in sixth grade, and was used by 60% of them in seventh grade.

In seventh grade, use of *anger leads to isolation from the social group* dropped below 50% from the year before, suggesting that girls may not be as concerned about this as they were in sixth grade. This may be because, unlike the first year of middle school, girls feel more secure in their social group and have a stronger group of close friends.

In eighth grade, the fewest number of participants who expressed a particular emotion was 0 and the highest was 9. In the last year of the study, the number of participants dropped from 15 to 11. All emotions expressed by more than 50% of participants in grades five through seven are expressed in eighth grade. However, several emotions drop below 50% of girls using them for the first time, including *anger as a catalyst*, *anger as a consequence*, and *anger as a reaction defensive*.

Interestingly, *moral anger* is used by more than 50% of the girls for the first time, which suggests that girls may be experiencing less self-focused anger and more anger on the behalf of others. The increase in *moral anger* makes sense in light of the fact that more eighth grade girls also report recognizing when others are feeling bad or sad. *Moral anger* is becoming angry on behalf of another after injustice; thus, as girls acknowledge that relational aggression makes their peers feel bad or sad, they become angry on the victim's behalf. *Guilt undefined* and *compassion* also drops below 50% of girls' using them for the first time. It is difficult to determine whether the percent drop-offs are due to the smaller number of participants creating this artifact in the data.

The type of anger that had a slow escalation was *anger as a consequence*, moving from 53% in fifth grade to 66% in sixth grade to 80% of girls using it by seventh grade. A similar trend was seen *anger as a reaction defensive*, which started at 40% in fifth grade, reaching 60% in sixth grade, and moving up to 73% of girls in seventh grade. This rise explains why, as girls get older, they are more reticent to intervene—they do not want to risk becoming involved in someone else's conflict. Nearly every girl utilizes *anger as a reaction offensive* across all three years.

Emotions that persist for more than 50% of the girls over all four years are *anger*, *anger as a reaction offensive*, *reflection on anger within the social group*, *feel bad/feel sad*, and *positive upstanding emotion*. *Positive upstanding emotion* is seen in 50% of the girls over all four years, suggesting that when girls do intervene for their friends, they experience a positive emotional reaction. In eighth grade, moral anger appears in 50% of the girls for the first time. The emotion that drops under 50% for the first time in eighth grade is guilt undefined. Fewer eighth grade girls are using



anger categories than in earlier years. In the self-conscious family, only *feel bad/feel sad* is used by more than 50% of the eighth graders. *Compassion* appears in all four years, although in eighth grade, it is used by less than 50% of the girls.

*Positive upstanding emotion* is used by at least half the girls all three years. In sixth grade, 73% of the girls expressed a *positive upstanding emotion*. This may be a moderate effect of participation in the study. *Awkward* is expressed by only 27% of the girls in eighth grade, which is a drop from 46% from girls' feeling it in seventh grade. This is still higher than the 6% of girls feeling it in fifth and sixth grade.

### *Summary*

Overall, the emotions that are expressed by at least 50% of the girls over all four years are *anger*, *anger as a reaction offensive*, *reflection on anger within the social group*, and *feel bad/feel sad*. *Positive upstanding emotion* is expressed by over 50% of girls in sixth, seventh, and eighth grade, whereas *compassion* is expressed by at least 50% of girls in fifth, sixth, and seventh grade.

For the fifth graders, *gratitude*, *jealous*, *embarrassed*, *disgust*, and all types of *guilt* except *undefined* were not expressed. In sixth grade, more girls demonstrate a greater repertoire of emotions. *Disgust*, *awkward*, *guilt*, and *gratitude* were rarely expressed. Seventh grade girls rarely expressed *disgust*, *guilt external*, and *gratitude*. By sixth and seventh grade, more girls evidence a wider range of emotions when dealing with relational aggression. By eighth grade, there's more emotional regulation, as girls rarely use *contempt*, *disappointment*, *disgust*, and *jealousy*. *Guilt*, *gratitude*, and *compassion* also rarely appear.

***Question two: What is the individual psychology of emotions for girls in relational aggression situations? How does this psychology change over time? That is, do girls have and maintain an emotional “constellation” that is consistent across all situations of relational aggression, or is there a constellation of emotions that is more fluid throughout the years?***

In order to address this question, each individual girl’s coded analyses of the interviews by year were examined to see how the preponderance of her emotional psychology changed over the four years of the study. In order to see which emotions were used predominantly, the criterion of 15% of total emotion codes was used to indicate predominance for each participant in a given year. Next, the dominance of emotions was examined, defined as emotions that made up 20% of the total emotions expressed by that individual that year. The 15% and 20% levels were selected to be the threshold of what is considered to be “predominant.” In the table below, in the individual cells, a light beige color represents the fact that at least 15% of the participant’s total codes were in that emotion category, and dark beige represents the fact that at least 20% of the participant’s total codes that year are in that emotion code. The numbers in the cells on the following tables represent the number of times that code appeared that year for that participant. Breaking out each girl in this way allows for an analysis of how individual psychology changes over time. The colors in the far left column in the table below signify the emotion family in the following way: Yellow is the other-condemning family, green is the self-conscious family, blue is the other-praising family, and red is the other-suffering family. The column headings

signify participant number and year (e.g., P2, 5 means participant 2 in fifth grade). In all tables, “missing” means that the interview was not completed for that participant.

Table 4: Emotional Constellations Participants 2 through 7

Participant by school year	P2, 5	6	7	8	P3, 5	6	7	8	P4, 5	6	7	8	P5, 5	6	7	8	P6, 5	6	7	8	P7, 5	6	7	8
Anger (emotion)	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	0	1	1	1	0	6	1	1	
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	1	0	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	4	1	1	3	0	0	3	0	1	0	5	
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (em	1	0	2	5	0	4	2	0	1	6	0	0	2	1	1	3	2	1	3	0	0	1	5	
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (em	0	4	2	5	0	7	2	0	1	7	14	1	1	2	4	3	13	3	9	3	6	8	5	
Anger as paralyzing and not sure h	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Anger leads to isolation from the s	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	
Contempt (emotion)	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Disappointed (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Disgust (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moral anger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Jealousy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	0	
Reflection on anger within the soci	2	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	2	10	2	0	4	2	1	5	4	1	1	1	3	6	1	
Awkward (emotion)	0	0	4	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Embarrassment (emotion)	0	3	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	2	6	2	3	2	2	2	1	4	0	2	1	3	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	4	2	4	
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	1	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Guilt undefined (emotion)	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	
Shame (emotion)	0	2	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	
Positive upstanding emotion (emot	2	10	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Gratitude (emotion)	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Compassion (emotion)	5	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	2	4	0	4	3	3	7	0	5	0	1	0	1	2	
TOTAL codes used by each girl:	17	37	27	29	2	29	27	2	15	40	37	7	29	26	17	34	25	32	20	9	26	27	28	missi

Key:

Percent of total codes in each emotion:

Light beige = at least 15% (but not more than 20%)

Dark beige = at least 20%

Cells denote N of codes in each category

Table 5: Emotional Constellations Participants 8 through 13

Participant by school year	P8, 5	6	7	8	P9, 5	6	7	8	P10, 5	6	7	8	P11, 5	6	7	8	P12, 5	6	7	8	P13, 5	6	7	8	P8, 5	6	7	8
Anger (emotion)	0	2	0	4	3	1	1	0	3	4	2		0	2	4		2	1	0	2	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	4
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	3	0		0	1	0		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	6	1	1	1	0	1	8	1	0	5	3		1	2	0		2	3	0	0	0	4	3	5	6	1	1	1
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (em)	4	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3		0	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3	0
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (em)	6	5	11	7	11	9	24	0	1	4	6		1	6	3		2	6	2	2	2	5	3	5	6	5	11	7
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to handle	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		0	5	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	2	1	10	0	0	1	25	1	0	1	0		0	2	0		0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	10	0
Contempt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		2	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disappointed (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Disgust (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0		0	0	0		0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Jealousy	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0
Reflection on anger within the social group	3	4	4	1	1	2	2	1	0	2	0		0	2	2		0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	3	4	4	1
Awkward (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Embarrassment (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	2	9	3	0	2	2	3	3	5	6	0		4	4	0		1	0	3	0	0	2	0	1	2	9	3	0
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guilt external (emotion)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	2	0		0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0		1	0	0		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt undefined (emotion)	0	3	3	0	3	3	2	0	4	2	0		1	3	0		0	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	3	3	0
Shame (emotion)	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	0
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	1	0		0	0	0		0	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Gratitude (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compassion (emotion)	5	2	7	1	1	0	3	3	1	4	1		1	0	0		0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	7	1
TOTAL codes used by each girl:	33	32	46	16	23	30	82	28	23	41	15	missin	12	28	9	missi	8	23	18	10	2	25	19	23	33	32	46	16

Key:

Percent of total codes in each emotion:

Light beige = at least 15% (but not more than 20%)

Dark beige = at least 20%

Cells denote N of codes in each category

Table 6: Emotional Constellations Participants 14 through 16

Participant by school year	P14, 5	6	7	8	P15, 5	6	7	8	P16, 5	6	7	8
Anger (emotion)	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	3	1	0	0	
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	1	2	
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	0	0	3	0	2	7	4	0	0	1	0	
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (em)	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (em)	3	0	2	3	1	6	9	1	3	2	3	
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to handle	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	
Contempt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0	
Disappointed (emotion)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	
Disgust (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Moral anger	0	1	3	0	2	4	0	0	2	0	1	
Jealousy	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	
Reflection on anger within the social group	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	
Awkward (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
Embarrassment (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	3	2	3	0	2	6	1	3	2	0	0	
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Guilt undefined (emotion)	4	0	3	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	0	
Shame (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	2	6	
Gratitude (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Compassion (emotion)	3	0	1	1	1	5	3	0	0	3	2	
TOTAL codes used by each girl:	19	4	25	7	14	47	31	21	13	16	16	missin

Key:

Percent of total codes in each emotion:

Light beige = at least 15% (but not more than 20%)

Dark beige = at least 20%

Cells denote N of codes in each category

Participant 2 expresses *compassion* in 20% of the codes in fifth grade, and in sixth grade, she expresses *positive upstanding emotion* in 20% of the codes. In seventh grade, she expresses *awkward* in 15% of the codes. However, by eighth grade, she experienced *anger as both an offensive and defensive* emotion in 15 % of the codes. In other words, she moves from being concerned about others and feeling good about standing up to them, to feeling awkward within the social group, and finally to being angry and trying to avoid others anger.

Participant 3 has no clear emotional prevalence, although in sixth grade twenty percent of her emotions were *anger as an offensive reaction*. However, she tended to observe others offensive anger rather than express it herself.

Participant 4 in fifth grade expresses a lot of *compassion*, but by sixth grade she has flipped to expressing various types of anger. In seventh grade, she speaks a lot of about *offensive anger*, and in eighth grade, all expressed emotions are less than 15%. Participant four shows an early trend, in which girls experience *compassion* in fifth and sixth grade and then express *anger* in seventh and eighth grade.

Participant 5 has no prevalent emotion expressed until seventh grade, when she predominantly speaks about *compassion*. In eighth grade, *compassion* increases, and she also speaks about *reflecting on anger within the social group*.

Participant 6 in fifth grade speaks a lot about *offensive anger* and reflects on *anger within the social group*. In sixth grade, she expresses *feeling bad or sad* and also feeling *compassionate*, as well as *shame*. In seventh grade she speaks about *anger*, especially *offensive anger*, which is a pattern that persists into eighth grade, when she also starts to *feel bad or sad* again.

Participant 7 in fifth grade experiences *anger* and *anger as a reaction* *offensive*, as well as *feeling bad or sad*. Over 20% of her emotion codes are *anger*. In sixth grade, *offensive anger* remains, and she also experiences *jealousy* and *reflection on anger*, along with *embarrassment*. In eighth grade, she experiences *offensive* and *defensive anger*, as well as *feeling bad and sad*. Eighth grade data is not available, although she is following a similar pattern to many of the other girls, in which anger is prevalent across all years.

Participant 8 experiences *anger* as well as *compassion* in 15% of the codes during fifth grade. In sixth grade, she expresses *feel bad/feel sad* in 20% of the codes, along with *offensive anger*. In seventh grade, *anger as isolation from the social group* comes in, although *compassion* increases, as does *offensive anger*. *Feel bad/feel sad* disappeared. In eighth grade, she expresses *anger* as a generalized emotion and *offensive anger*. She, like other participants, shifts from feeling *compassion* to feeling *anger*.

Participant 9 experiences *offensive anger* more than 20% of her responses in fifth through seventh grade. By eighth grade, her *anger* dissipates, and she expresses *positive upstanding emotions*. She experiences the opposite shift (from anger to more caring emotions), and this could be because a lot of her anger led to isolation from the social group and by eighth grade, she may have decided to try to get back into the social group by standing up for others.

Participant 10 in fifth grade expressed *moral anger* in over 20% of the codes, which is interesting because as a group, *moral anger* does not become a prevalent emotion until eighth grade. In addition, she expressed *feeling bad and feeling sad* in



20% of the codes. She also expressed generalized *guilt* in 15% of the codes. In comparison to the rest of the participants, she has moralistic leanings. In sixth grade, her *moral anger* persists. In seventh grade, her *moral anger* shifts to *offensive anger*, *defensive anger*, and understanding *anger as a consequence*. There is no data for eighth grade. While participant ten may have more moralistic tendencies than the rest of the cohort, she follows the same pattern of those feelings changing to anger as she ages.

Participant 11, in fifth grade, expresses both *contempt* and *feeling bad and sad*. In sixth grade, her contempt turns into *offensive anger* and she also feels *paralyzed by her anger*. In seventh grade, she expresses *generalized anger* and *offensive anger* and *reflection on anger within the social group*. In eighth grade, she dropped out of the study. As she aged, participant eleven may have found herself on the outside of the social group and thus both more aware of and more reflective on the anger of the group.

Participant 12, in fifth grade, experiences *generalized anger*, *anger as a consequence*, and *offensive anger*. In sixth grade, she experiences *offensive anger*, but also picks up *positive upstanding emotion*. In seventh grade, she maintains her *positive upstanding emotion*, and she also *feels bad or sad*. In eighth grade, she experiences *generalized anger*, *offensive anger*, and *reflects on anger within the social group*. Her experiences of being in tune with the experiences of victims may have made her more reflective about anger in eighth grade and how it influences the social group.

Participant 13 experiences *offensive anger* in fifth grade, which persists across all four years. She expresses *anger as a consequence* in sixth grade, which also

persists throughout eighth grade, although it went up to over 20% in eighth grade (like offensive anger).

Participant 14 experiences both *guilt* and *feeling bad and sad* in fifth grade, as well as *compassion* and *offensive anger*. In sixth grade, she experiences *moral anger*, *feeling bad and sad*, and *positive upstanding emotion*, all of which were expressed in 20% or more of her emotion codes. However, there were only four emotion codes for that year, so these percentages may be inflated. In seventh grade, no emotions were coded at even 15%. In eighth grade, she only expressed seven coded emotions, all of which were *anger*.

Participant 15 expresses no strong emotion in fifth grade. In sixth grade, she speaks about *anger as a consequence* in over 20% of the codes. In seventh grade, she speaks of *offensive anger*, and in eighth grade, no strong emotions emerge.

Participant 16 discusses *offensive anger*, *disappointment*, *moral anger*, and *feeling bad and sad*. In sixth grade, *compassion* appears in 15% of the codes. In seventh grade, *offensive anger* and *positive upstanding emotion* appear. There is no data for eighth grade.

#### *Summary of individual analyses by year*

What is striking in this analysis is the lack of self-conscious emotions for most of the girls; a few of them speak about embarrassment, but very rarely, and guilt also does not appear frequently across the data set. Instead, girls begin very focused on others and feeling compassion for them, but this concern transforms to anger by eighth grade for the majority of girls. Also, anger seems to motivate more conflict than disgust, which is contrary to newer literature within the field, which suggests that

moral violations occur when the aggressor feels disgust toward others. In their interviews, girls also speak frequently about ignoring and rising about the drama, yet when looking at the emotions about which they speak, which they notice, and which they express, it is clear that they both experience a lot of internalized anger and notice the anger of their peers.

### *Case studies*

A comparative case study illustrates the complexity of the emotional lives of girls in this study. In choosing the two cases, girls who had two differing emotional experiences were selected to see how the various emotions expressed affected them as they aged over these four years. These were participants 2 and 9.

#### *Case Study 1: Participant 2*

Participant 2 begins the study expressing *positive upstanding emotion* and *compassion* for others in 20% of the codes, in fifth and sixth grade, respectively. In sixth grade, she also speaks about *feel bad/feel sad*. In fifth grade participant 2 says, “sometimes like I’m in a group of friends and when my group of friends stick up for each other, I feel happy and proud that we make someone feel better” (Interview 1, Year 1). This quote is typical of the emotion expressed by participant 2 in fifth grade—she likes standing up for others, and by doing so, she feels that she is maintaining her friend group. Specifically, she likes “the feeling that we made someone happy” (Interview 1, Year 1). Interestingly, participant 2 frequently speaks about “we,” meaning her and her friends and seems intensely interpersonal.

By sixth grade, participant 2’s *positive upstanding emotion* has transformed into *compassion*, which is an important distinction, as *positive upstanding emotion* is

elicited when someone intervenes for another, whereas *compassion* can be felt without intervention. For example, when discussing a situation where she and her friends were competing for attention for a new girl, participant 2 reflects that she should have had more compassion for the girl, rather than pressuring her to choose a friendship group. She also notes that as a bystander, rather than intervening all the time, she tries to comfort the victim after the fact.

In another situation, participant 2 acknowledges that she often does not intervene; instead she tries to do something after the aggression:

Well I sometimes go up and stand up for that person, but usually if it's just something small I'll leave, I'll let it go and say okay I really hope that they'll work that out. But I feel really sorry for the person who is doing that but I don't do anything usually (Interview 1, Year 2).

Later in that scenario, she says that if she were to intervene, she would confront the bully, but she does not explain why she chooses not to. Participant 2 also notes that if more people did stand up for each other, things would be better.

However, by seventh grade, participant 2 talks about feeling *awkward* in 15% of the codes. This is a transformation again from an other-suffering emotion to a self-conscious emotion; specifically that standing up for someone would make the entire situation “awkward.”

Usually, no one usually says anything except for like the person who is teasing because it's kind of, I don't know it's embarrassing if, it's just kind of awkward when someone stands up for you, you can't really say anything or else people will tease you more. It's just awkward” (Interview 2, Year 3).

What is striking about this quote is that she has previously noted that the most important thing in the situation is that the victim not get teased anymore, but the potential for awkwardness stops her from intervening and helping. Her focus on her own self-conscious emotions, rather than the other-suffering of her peers, stops her from intervening or even from comforting after the fact, as she may have done in previous years. Furthermore, she notes that when she has been the victim of teasing, that while it might be “nice” for someone else to step in, “it would have been kind of awkward if someone stood up for me, like I’d be embarrassed that I couldn’t do anything for myself” (Interview 2, Year 3). In other words, in seventh grade, participant 2 has become very self-conscious, to the point where she would be embarrassed to get help from her friends. This is in stark contrast to fifth grade, when she reported feeling “happy and proud” when she and her friends stood up for each other and for other victims of bullying. Her *compassion* is also no longer in evidence—again, the focus is on how awkward an intervention could potentially be.

By eighth grade, however, these self-conscious and other-suffering emotions have dissipated completely. Instead, participant 2 experiences *offensive and defensive anger* 15% of the codes. When discussing how to avoid others’ anger while also being true to the self, participant 2 says:

Well like I said you have to stand up for what you believe in, but at some point if you’re going to have a big huge fight over it, you just kind of have to say I respect your opinion and cut it off because it’ll just get worse and you’ll get mad at each other...if changing your opinion your opinion, I mean it will help

you fit in if the people you are trying to fit in with if you have the same opinion but I would just avoid talking about it (Interview 1, Year 4).

Rather than standing up for herself and her beliefs, participant 2 focuses on holding a consistent internal belief but simply tolerating disagreements with her friends.

Avoiding anger is more important than standing up for beliefs and engaging in honest conversation. Again, this is a large difference from fifth grade, when she would have felt secure with her friends to confront them and have discussions. Also interesting is her use of “I” in contrast to the “we” of her younger years. As she has matured, participant 2 has learned how to conceal her inner self and control her emotional response.

She also uses wanting to avoid others’ anger as a reason not to stand up for someone, even though she “felt bad” after the fact (Interview 2, Year 4). However, the risk made her not want to get involved and stand up for the victim. When asked for further reasoning about why she did not stand up, participant 2 says:

I was afraid that if I had stood up for that girl they thought was different and weird then they would pick on me because I was on her side... I should have stood up for her because even if they pick on me they’ll eventually forget about and if it would have helped her in the future so... (Interview 2, Year 4).

In retrospect, participant 2 knows that it would not have been a big deal, but in the moment, her self-conscious emotions stop her from coming to the aid of someone in need, as well as her fear of the offensive anger of others. The only time she does come to someone’s aid, it is her best friend and it is because she feels morally outraged that her friend is being picked on for something she cannot control (in this case, her name).

*Case 2: Participant 9*

Participant 9 has the opposite journey. She moves from expressing *anger* and from bullying others to expressing *positive emotions around upstanding* in eighth grade. In fifth grade, participant 9 says:

I'd rather have people talk behind my back and it not get to me than people talking behind my back and getting it to me because then I know what they're saying. A lot of times I get mad at my friends because they're talking behind my back with my knowing...I mean, if you're going to talk behind someone's back, do it in secret, because it makes it a lot better (Year 1, Interview 1).

When asked why she'd rather not know what her friends are saying, she says:

Because it just hurts your feelings to know what people are saying, and actually it kind of protects you to know that people, to not know that people are talking behind your back because it makes you feel like wow, I'm a good person, they're not saying anything bad behind my back (Year 1, Interview 1).

However, even though she knows how it hurts to have others gossip about her, participant 9 admits to not only gossiping about others, but also using "spies" to discover what others are saying about her:

There's my friend...she's friends with both sides and I'll say something like, and she'll go tell them or a lot of times, we'll tell her to spy on the other person and she'll spy and then she'll tell us all the information...and then we get the information that we need to know and then we kind of use it against the person (Year 1, Interview 1).

Rather than working with her friends to stand up to bullies like participant 2, participant 9 is actively stirring the pot and using others to start conflict and anger. Additionally, rather than wanting to know what her friends are saying or confronting her friends directly, participant 9 wants to remain in ignorance, and thus ignore what might be going on. Ignoring what her friends are saying (or simply not knowing) allows her to maintain her friendships and avoid conflict within a social space in which she must interact with her friends, yet she also chooses to start conflict with other groups. In this way she can have friends while also manipulating the social group. This motivation to maintain friendships is seen across all girls and all years—rather than risking confrontation, the girls want to know, but do not want to have open conflict. In fact, when recounting a real-life conflict with one of her friends, participant 9 says:

It was right before the VS [variety show] [and] my friend said something that really hurt my feelings and at the VS I was really mad because they really hurt my feelings and I, it was just kind of one of those moments I can't get mad at the VS because I had a really big part, so it kind of made me not think about it and it just went away, although I still kind of like, said stuff to, I gave them hints that I was still mad (Year 1, Interview 1).

When angry with her friend, participant 9 chooses to ignore her feelings and attempt to avoid direct confrontation by giving subtle hints that she is angry. However, participant 9 has a different reaction when asked about the hypothetical Cassie dilemma. Karen, the victim in this story, hears what her friends Cassie, Dixie, and



Alana are saying about her. When asked how Karen should handle this dilemma, participant 9 replies:

Karen should probably tell the girls what she thinks about what they did to her and then get her respect. That's what she should do, that's what a girl would do. But what she should really do is tell them how she feels (Year 1, Interview 3).

However, when asked how Karen could be strong enough to stand up to her friends, participant 9 replies, "I'm not sure about that actually" (Year 1, Interview 3). In this situation, participant 9's response is similar to what participant 2 said in eighth grade. It seems that *offensive anger*, rather than prompting people to stand up, instead prompts people to withdraw and to create a split between private feelings and public reactions.

In sixth grade, the pattern of *anger as an emotion (offensive)* continues for participant 9. It is the emotion that she expresses in at least 20% of the codes, and she uses tactics to manipulate and control the social group. After a large fight with her friend where she said something really mean, participant 9 is not interested in fixing the friendship. Instead she wants to smooth it over:

I would be sorry for all this stuff even if I wasn't cause I knew I wasn't—she sometimes, sometimes she was being meaner than I was ever and I was apologizing even though I thought she should be but I was like...I really like this friend so I don't want to mess it up" (Year 2, Interview 1).

Participant 9 claims to really like her friend, yet her concern is about minimizing the anger and smoothing over the social group. Like participant 2 who does not confront if

it might negatively affect the group, participant 9 does not really forgive her friend or work out the conflict—she just apologizes repeatedly. Moreover, participant 9 speaks repeatedly about sending mean emails because the person “deserved it.” She uses these emails to hurt others and again, to maintain her place within the social hierarchy.

This pattern of *anger* continues throughout seventh grade, although participant 9 also starts to reflect on how *anger might lead to isolation from the social group*, particularly her own isolation from her own social group. In particular, her friends are tired of her starting drama and have begun to remove her from the inner circle.

Recounting a fight that she had with another girl, participant 9 says:

But she was like you always get mad at me for these little stuff. You always do, you never leave me alone and she does that to me, she’s the one that’s making it, a lot of the girls turn the fight around...And we just sort of made up. But it, they don’t want to be the one apologizing. I’m always the one apologizing, always. But I rarely get mad at people and when I do I just sort of like keep to myself (Year 3, Interview 1).

In contrast to being the girl in fifth and sixth grade who aggressively goes after others and overtly manipulated the group, participant 9 reports that these tactics are now used against her. In a sense, she is similar to participant 2 in the sense that she is apologizing frequently and being made to feel self-conscious about her reactions and her responses. Her peer group begins to use this self-consciousness to control her more than they could previously. Because of her previous behavior, any time that she expresses an emotion, it is used against her, unlike participant 2, who because of her history is simply able to avoid the conflict. Like participant 2, who seems self-

conscious and concerned about isolation from the group, participant 9 reports being concerned about isolation. While it does not prompt her to change her behavior immediately, she is reflecting on how her behavior might lead to her separation from the group (unlike participant 2, who focuses on how being awkward or creating awkward situations might lead to social isolation).

By eighth grade, however, participant 9 realizes that her previous behavior has led to her isolation from the social group, and she begins to be more honest with them:

I think I just told them how I was feeling. I mean like, I don't think they had anything wrong with me in the beginning, I just wasn't as close to them and I was afraid that if I tried to be closer they would find me even more annoying or more, they wouldn't like me even more. And I just kind of talked to them and asked them why they didn't like me. They didn't have a solid answer but then I just said you know why do you ignore me and they kind of just got the message...I used to be a really bad person. I used to be a lot meaner. But I think something just changed and I wanted to be better and I think they realized that to some extent (Year 4, Interview 1).

Because she is now the target of exclusion, she realizes she has to approach the group in a different way. Her new experience as the victim allows her a different perspective from which to approach the social conflicts; she is more willing to disengage and be on her own. In fact, when asked how she feels about herself as a person, she states:

I'm actually happy. I've gotten a lot better at that makes me happy because I don't have to worry about my being the bad person. I can always be like in that situation I didn't do anything wrong. I know I didn't. Like I was trying to be

the good person. So I don't have to feel bad about what I do, my actions. I don't have to look back and be like oh my God I wish I hadn't done that (Year 4, Interview 1).

As her position within the social group shifts, so do her emotional reactions and her ability to control herself. Staying out of the drama allows her to feel better about herself as a person (which is a contrast from her fifth grade year, in which she repeatedly discussed liking the power involved in being the bully and enjoying spying on other social groups and using the information that she gathered to cause conflict). Controlling her reaction to situations (emotion) allows her to decide to stay out of conflicts (judgment), in part due to consideration of other factors (peer status and consequences). She then has the ability to make a judgment of responsibility, which in many cases is the choice to bystand, but she can bystand with some sense of integrity, as she has not actively contributed to the conflict.

She also chooses to stand up for others who are being bullied, and this action allows her to express positive upstanding emotion more than 15% of the codes:

I stopped talking about people a lot more. I've just realized that it gets, I mean I just get in a lot more fights if I do. Even if it's just to someone I can trust, they always tell someone else they think they can trust and it just kind of ends up badly...sometimes they just don't get along, but I try to make it so if they're talking about one of my friends I just stick up for them or I just don't pitch in (Year 4, Interview 1).

Like participant 2 in fifth grade, participant 9 in eighth grade worries about sticking up for her friends and maintaining the friendships in that way, rather than using anger to

control the group. In eighth grade, participant 9 also has a different perspective on the hypothetical dilemma, one that more closely aligns with her real-life approach. When asked what Karen should do, Participant 9 replies:

She should just let it go and then maybe talk to Alana because she was her friend and then forget about the other girls...it's not worth it to deal with those mean girls I don't think. I don't they're ever really going to change so just better to stick with the people you know you were friends with, close friends with and then work it out with them (Year 4, Interview 4).

Rather than trying to instigate or arguing that Karen should try to get revenge, participant 9 encourages her to find her true friend group and to connect with those people. Reflecting on her own actions, participant 9 says “I still wish that they hadn't said anything about her but now that I stood up, I feel good. I feel like this is what I was supposed to do, what I should have done” (Year 4, Interview 1).

The pattern shown by participant 2 is seen across the majority of other girls in the study. While they may evidence *compassion*, *guilt*, and *positive upstanding emotions* early in the study, by seventh and eighth grade most of them evidence being *angry* and not intervening on the behalf of others. This is one of the significant findings of the study—not that girls are angry, but that even girls who are not angry become other-condemning by the end of middle school. What is troubling about this trend, as shown by participant 2, is that her self-consciousness leads her to be afraid of the anger of others and to want to intensely avoid it. Even for girls who do not report being as self-conscious as participant 2, wanting to avoid the drama causes them to focus on others' anger and how they can avoid it rather than to look at the suffering of

others and to see how good it feels to help victimized others. Participant 9 has the opposite journey. By eighth grade, she has stopped victimizing and manipulating and instead takes pride in helping others. Interestingly, participants 2 and 9 seem motivated by the same wish to maintain their friendships and keep the social group together. In the case of participant 2, she avoids anger to maintain her status within the group; in the case of participant 9, she changes her ways because her scheming has caused her to be ostracized by eighth grade and she wants to get back in with her friends.

As these participants age, they focus more and more on “avoid the drama,” which may explain why they are more willing to disengage from each other’s anger and thus disengage from the target of that anger. As they get ready to transition to a larger high school, many girls are focused on shoring up their friendship groups. Entering ninth grade on the lowest rung in the social structure, girls are focused on having good friends and on avoiding friends who might reflect badly on them. Thus, they try to avoid anger and they disengage from intense conflicts.

***Question three: How do girls report their awareness of their emotions and how do they evidence emotional regulation?***

When coding the data, a series of codes that could be considered “emotional awareness” emerged from the data. Again, these codes did not come from Haidt (2003) but instead emerged from the data. These codes looked at emotional awareness in various forms, including emotional downregulation. These codes indicated how girls monitored their own and others’ emotional states, how awareness of these states could lead to paralysis, how awareness of these states caused girls to control their own

behavior more closely, how girls reflected on their own and others' emotional states, and how they downregulated their own emotions and tried to help others downregulate. In examining the co-occurrence data, girls tended to use these strategies to end conflicts or to avoid the conflicts from starting. When angry with someone, girls reported *engaging in other behaviors* and *disengaging from the situation*. For example, participant 2 says that when someone is being mean to her, "Well sometimes I just kind of okay it's not that big of a deal but if they're actually like really hurting my feelings, I'll just walk away and I'll think in my head, I'll say oh they're idiots. So it helps me" (Year 2, Interview 1). In this example, she is disengaging, but as she disengages, she demonstrates control over her emotions (*emotional awareness self-control*) and *emotional downregulation*. In the aftermath of conflict, participant 2 reports that she does not forget these incidences, because "you don't want to just forgive them all the time and be nice to them because they'll just keep doing it and they'll think you're really stupid...So if you ignore them instead of just saying oh that's okay whatever, just go ahead tease me" [sic] (Year 2, Interview 1). In other words, the *monitoring* and *self-control* continues after the immediate conflict is over; rather than reacting, participant 2 has learned to disengage and control her emotions.

In fifth grade, there were 94 co-occurrences of emotions and awareness. The range was from 0 to 8. By sixth grade, this had jumped to 226 and the range is from 0 to 15. In seventh grade, the total number of co-occurrences drops to 158 and the range is 0 to 15, and in eighth grade the total drops further to 79 and the range is 0 to 4. In the tables below, column A is *emotional awareness monitoring*, column B is

*emotional awareness paralyzing*, column C is *emotional awareness reflection*, column D is *emotional awareness self-control*, and column E is *emotional downregulation*.



Table 7: Fifth Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness

	A	B	C	D	E	TOTALS:
Anger	8	0	0	4	3	15
Anger as a catalyst	0	0	1	3	1	5
Anger as a consequence	3	0	0	1	0	4
Anger as a reaction (defensive)	2	0	1	3	1	7
Anger as a reaction (offensive)	6	0	1	5	4	16
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to handle it	2	1	1	1	1	6
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awkward	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compassion	3	0	3	3	3	12
Disappointed	0	0	1	0	0	1
Embarrassment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feel bad/Feel sad	3	0	1	2	1	7
Guilt	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt as a catalyst to act	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt consequence	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt external	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt transition torn	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt undefined	3	0	1	0	1	5
Jealous	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	1	0	1	0	0	2
Positive upstanding emotion	1	0	1	0	1	3
Reflection on anger within the social group	6	0	1	2	2	11
Shame	0	0	0	0	0	0
	38	1	13	24	18	94

N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined

Key:

A=*emotional awareness monitoring*

B=*emotional awareness paralyzing*

C=*emotional awareness reflection*

D=*emotional awareness self-control*

E=*emotional downregulation*

Table 8: Sixth Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness

	A	B	C	D	E	TOTALS:
Anger	10	0	2	7	3	22
Anger as a catalyst	10	1	2	4	1	18
Anger as a consequence	2	1	4	5	3	15
Anger as a reaction (defensive)	3	0	0	10	4	17
Anger as a reaction (offensive)	15	1	6	13	5	40
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to handle it	3	1	2	0	1	7
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	2	0	1	0	0	3
Awkward	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compassion	5	0	1	1	1	8
Disappointed	0	0	1	0	0	1
Embarrassment	1	0	0	0	0	1
Feel bad/Feel sad	4	1	6	1	3	15
Guilt	1	0	0	0	0	1
Guilt as a catalyst to act	0	0	1	0	0	1
Guilt consequence	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt external	0	1	1	0	0	2
Guilt internal	1	0	1	0	0	2
Guilt transition torn	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt undefined	2	0	4	1	1	8
Jealous	1	0	3	4	6	14
Moral anger	4	1	0	1	0	6
Positive upstanding emotion	7	0	3	3	1	14
Reflection on anger within the social group	11	1	3	11	3	29
Shame	1	0	1	0	0	2
	83	8	42	61	32	226

N=number of co-occurences for all participants combined

Key:

A=*emotional awareness monitoring*

B=*emotional awareness paralyzing*

C=*emotional awareness reflection*

D=*emotional awareness self-control*

E=*emotional downregulation*

Table 9: Seventh Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness

	A	B	C	D	E	TOTALS:
Anger	10	0	0	5	3	18
Anger as a catalyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anger as a consequence	2	2	2	7	2	15
Anger as a reaction (defensive)	2	1	1	3	1	8
Anger as a reaction (offensive)	10	1	7	15	10	43
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to handle it	1	1	0	0	0	2
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	2	0	4	10	3	19
Awkward	2	1	0	0	0	3
Compassion	3	0	2	3	1	9
Disappointed	1	0	0	0	0	1
Embarrassment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feel bad/Feel sad	5	0	1	5	2	13
Guilt	1	0	0	0	0	1
Guilt as a catalyst to act	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt consequence	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt external	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal	1	0	0	0	0	1
Guilt transition torn	1	0	0	0	0	1
Guilt undefined	2	1	0	1	0	4
Jealous	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	0	0	0	1	0	1
Positive upstanding emotion	6	0	0	2	0	8
Reflection on anger within the social group	3	0	2	2	2	9
Shame	1	0	0	1	0	2
	53	7	19	55	24	158

N=number of co-occurences for all participants combined

Key:

A=*emotional awareness monitoring*

B=*emotional awareness paralyzing*

C=*emotional awareness reflection*

D=*emotional awareness self-control*

E=*emotional downregulation*

Table 10: Eighth Grade Co-occurrence of Emotions by Emotional Awareness

	A	B	C	D	E	TOTALS:
Anger	2	0	2	3	1	8
Anger as a catalyst	1	0	0	0	1	2
Anger as a consequence	2	0	0	3	3	8
Anger as a reaction (defensive)	1	0	0	2	2	5
Anger as a reaction (offensive)	4	0	0	4	1	9
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to handle it	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	2	0	0	2	1	5
Awkward	2	0	0	1	0	3
Compassion	2	1	0	0	0	3
Disappointed	1	0	0	0	0	1
Embarrassment	1	0	0	0	0	1
Feel bad/Feel sad	4	0	0	0	0	4
Guilt	1	0	0	0	0	1
Guilt as a catalyst to act	1	0	0	0	0	1
Guilt consequence	3	0	0	0	0	3
Guilt external	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal	4	0	1	0	0	5
Guilt transition torn	1	1	0	1	0	3
Guilt undefined	2	0	0	0	0	2
Jealous	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	1	0	0	0	1	2
Positive upstanding emotion	3	0	0	0	0	3
Reflection on anger within the social group	2	0	0	4	2	8
Shame	1	0	0	1	0	2
	41	2	3	21	12	79

N=number of co-occurences for all participants combined

Key:

A=*emotional awareness monitoring*

B=*emotional awareness paralyzing*

C=*emotional awareness reflection*

D=*emotional awareness self-control*

E=*emotional downregulation*

Much of the emotional awareness in all years is connected to the anger categories. In fifth and sixth grade, girls are *aware* of generalized *anger*. In sixth grade, however, about 25% of the co-occurrences are between internalized emotions such as *compassion* or *guilt*, but 50% are occur between all the types of *anger*. In seventh grade, a third of *emotional awareness* co-occur around *anger*, and in eighth grade, 40% of *awareness* is centered on various types of *anger*. Across all four years, girls are highly aware of their own and of others' *anger*.

The same pattern repeats across all four years with other types of emotional awareness. In fifth grade, 100% of *paralyzing emotional awareness* is connected to anger. In sixth grade, 50% of this *awareness* centers on *anger* codes. In seventh grade, 70% of *paralyzing emotional awareness* is associated with *anger* codes, and in eighth grade, *emotional awareness paralyzing* was not observed.

In fifth grade, a third of the occurrences coded as *reflection on emotional states* centers on the various types of *anger*. The rest is evenly distributed among other emotions. In sixth grade, approximately half the *reflection* centers on the *anger* codes. In seventh grade, however, this jumps to 73%, suggesting that girls are reflecting more on anger in themselves and in their peers. In eighth grade, the percentage of *emotional awareness reflection* associated with *anger* drops slightly to 66%.

The next type of emotional awareness is around *self-control*. In fifth grade, 70% of the co-occurrences center on the *anger* codes. In sixth grade, this drops to 63%, suggesting that girls are still aware of anger and use this awareness to control their reactions, just at a slightly lower rate. In seventh grade, *self-control* co-occurs with *anger* 72% of the codes, and in eighth grade, the co-occurrence percentage is

again 66%. Throughout all four years of the study, then, girls pay attention to anger and use this awareness to control themselves and how they react in social situations.

The last type of emotional awareness is *downregulation*, when girls express acting to relax their emotional state, especially in times on conflict. In fifth grade, this co-occurs with *anger* 55% of the codes. In sixth grade, this rate stays relatively unchanged at 53%. In seventh grade, the rate jumps to 79%, suggesting that as girls stop taking others perspectives and start isolating each other more, they also have to downregulate their anger more often in order to better control the social situation. In eighth grade, this rate drops back to 66%, which, compared to fifth and sixth grade, still suggests that as they get older, girls use *downregulation* more frequently when dealing with conflicts with others.

Girls engage in this behavior (when discussing how reflecting on their emotions might make a situation better, they universally mean by downregulating their anger, not by focusing on it). One participant even notes that thinking about the situation might make someone even angrier.

Another important dimension of awareness in this study is forgetting. Girls discuss “forgetting” things; that is, to actively try to not recall situations of aggression or perhaps negative emotion. This may be their attempt to stop ruminating on anger and avoid further conflicts. However, they also report that they keep conflicts in the back of their minds. While they may not be consciously ruminating on the anger like more clinical populations seem to do, these past conflicts do repeat themselves within friendship groups. Frequently, they were not really forgetting, but it was a quick way of describing their attempts to block it out and move on without causing tension within

the social group. Participants also spoke about forgiveness. However, this was not a sense of transformative forgiveness in which the conflict is discussed and reparations are made. Instead, pressure was frequently put on a victim to “forgive” the bully by stopping the fight and stop mentioning the conflict.

In short, across all four years and all types of awareness, *anger* in its various forms is the emotion that most co-occurs. This pattern is also observed when looking at relationships between emotions and actions and emotions and motivations. Girls are keenly aware of anger and work hard to control it and to respond in various ways to it. Frequently this involves downregulating the emotion, but it can trigger upstanding and confronting a bully on behalf of the self. However, anger can also trigger isolation and mob mentality, in which responsibility for negative actions gets diffused over the group.

These emotional processes guide girls in making decisions, and often times, girls are not aware that they are using these strategies unless asked to reflect upon them in the interview. However, girls agree that regulating their own and encouraging their friends to regulate emotions leads to fewer conflicts. What is not clear is how this consistent downregulation might affect girls’ long-term emotional health. As Brown (2003, 1997) and others have pointed out, girls’ repressing their anger leads to the construction of false identity and may lead to long-term self-esteem problems and long-term issues with solving conflicts.

***Question four: How do moral emotions affect action choices girls make in RA situations?***

In order to assess how emotions affect action choices, co-occurrences between emotion and action were examined over all four years (see Tables 11-14 below). In fifth grade, there were 89 co-occurrences between emotion and action, and the frequencies ranged from 0 to 6. In sixth grade, there were 218 co-occurrences between emotion and action, and frequencies ranged from 0 to 16. In seventh grade, there were 211 co-occurrences between emotion and action, and the frequencies ranged from 0 to 16, and in eighth grade, there were 108 total co-occurrences and frequencies ranged from 0 to 6. Please note that the colors in the tables below do not have special significance; they were used to sort high, medium, and low for the analysis: Low was 1 to 3 (highlighted green in the tables), medium was 4 to 7 (highlighted red in the table), and high was 8+ (highlighted yellow in the table). These thresholds were selected by the researchers relative to the frequencies of totals seen in the data, most of which ranged from 0-6, as mentioned above.



Table 11: Fifth Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action

Fifth Grade	Confront (acti	Disengage (acti	Engage in another behi	Forget (action	Forgive (actioi	Group think	Ignore (action	Isolate (action)	Perspective ta	Redirect groui	Upstand (acti	Upstand in order to maintain
Anger (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (emotion)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (emotion)	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	1	2	0
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Anger leads to isolation from the social g	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awkward (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Compassion (emotion)	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	2	2	0
Contempt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Disappointed (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embarrassment (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	0	1	0
Gratitude (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt undefined (emotion)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1
Jealous (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Reflection on anger within the social gro	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0
Shame (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS:	3	15	2	1	4	2	1	12	29	5	11	4

89

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

Table 12: Sixth Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action

Sixth Grade	Confront (acti	Disengage (acti	Engage in another beh	Forget (action	Forgive (actioi	Group think	Ignore (action	Isolate (action)	Perspective ta	Redirect grou	Upstand (acti	Upstand in order to maintain
Anger (emotion)	3	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	6	0	0	0
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	2	0	2	1	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	0
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	0
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (emotion)	5	2	1	0	2	3	0	5	8	0	2	0
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Anger leads to isolation from the social g	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	3	0	0	0
Awkward (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Compassion (emotion)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	7	1
Contempt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	0	0	0
Disappointed (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embarrassment (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0
Gratitude (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
Guilt consequence (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Guilt undefined (emotion)	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0
Jealous (emotion)	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Moral anger	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	13	0
Reflection on anger within the social gro	3	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	16	0	1	0
Shame (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0
TOTALS:	27	5	10	10	8	15	1	32	65	1	43	1

218

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

Table 13: Seventh Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action

Seventh Grade	Confront (acti	Disengage (acti	Engage in another beh	Forget (action	Forgive (actio	Group think	Ignore (action	Isolate (action)	Perspective ta	Redirect grou	Upstand (acti	Upstand in order to maintain
Anger (emotion)	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	3	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	3	1
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (emotion)	16	2	2	1	5	7	0	12	7	0	1	0
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anger leads to isolation from the social g	3	0	0	1	3	11	0	12	2	0	2	0
Awkward (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
Compassion (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	5	0
Contempt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0
Disappointed (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embarrassment (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	10	1	0	0	0
Gratitude (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Guilt undefined (emotion)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	0
Jealous (emotion)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	0
Reflection on anger within the social gro	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	4	0	0	0
Shame (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
TOTALS:	32	5	4	4	15	33	6	50	23	1	36	2

211

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

Table 14: Eighth Grade Co-occurrences of Emotion by Action

Eighth Grade	Confront (action)	Disengage (action)	Engage in another behavior (action)	Forget (action)	Forgive (action)	Group think (action)	Ignore (action)	Isolate (action)	Perspective taking (action)	Redirect group (action)	Upstand (action)	Upstand in order to maintain (action)
Anger (emotion)	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	5	0	0	0
Anger as a catalyst (emotion)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Anger as a consequence (emotion)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
Anger as a reaction (defensive) (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Anger as a reaction (offensive) (emotion)	6	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	1	0	2	0
Anger as paralyzing and not sure how to	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Anger leads to isolation from the social group (emotion)	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	6	2	0	0	0
Awkward (emotion)	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Compassion (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0
Contempt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disappointed (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embarrassment (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feel bad/Feel sad (emotion)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	1	0
Gratitude (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Guilt as a catalyst to act (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt consequence (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt external (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guilt internal (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Guilt transition torn (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Guilt undefined (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Jealous (emotion)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moral anger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Positive upstanding emotion (emotion)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
Reflection on anger within the social group (emotion)	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	0	0	0
Shame (emotion)	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	0
TOTALS:	18	0	2	5	4	11	7	20	23	2	16	0

108

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

In fifth grade, girls engage in *perspective taking* when they experience *anger as a reaction offensive, reflection on anger within the social group, compassion, or feel bad/feel sad*. As bystanders, *anger* and *compassion* make girls take another perspective in order to understand what is happening, whereas when girls are victims and *feel bad*, they use *perspective taking* to try to understand why they are being victimized and see if there is a way they can change their behavior in order to stop the victimization. Girls feel *bad/feel sad* when they experience *isolation* or when they see others being isolated. There is also a relationship between *compassion* and *disengagement*. For example, participant 2 discusses a conflict in which girls were competing for the attention of a new girl. In a combination of *compassion, disengagement, and perspective-taking*, participant 2 says “I thought that not—we shouldn’t be fighting. We should back off and let her talk to everybody and see” (Year 1, Interview 2). Disengaging from the conflict or the situation can sometimes be the most compassionate action in order to de-escalate the conflict. Often, they narrated that process in the interview. It was a frequent strategy discussed when deciding if to intervene in a conflict.

In sixth grade, the actions that co-occur with the most emotions were *perspective-taking, upstand, isolate, and confront*. Less frequent, but also present, are *groupthink, forgive, forget, and engage in another behavior*. *Perspective taking* has relationships to *anger, compassion, anger as a reaction offensive, or reflection on anger*. *Anger* is really the source of *perspective taking* for both 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade years. The emotions associated with *upstanding* are *compassion* and *positive upstanding emotion*. Participant 2 notes that when she sees someone being bullied, “if I did

something about it, I would go up there and help that person and say back off bully, you're hurting this person's feeling. And I would suggest that the victim, that they fill out a student form because that would help them a lot" (Interview 1, Year 2). In this example, participant 2 has compassion for the distress being felt by the victim and upstands in order to end the conflict.

*Isolate* also has a connection to all categories of *anger* and *contempt*. Girls will also *confront* each other when they are feeling all types of *anger*. *Forgiving* and *forgetting* are not associated with any specific emotions.

In seventh grade, *isolation* is related to *anger* and to *feel bad/feel sad*. Girls acknowledge that when others are isolated due to an aggressor's anger, they feel sad. Moreover, when reporting their own isolation, participants often identify feeling bad or sad, even if they try to hide that emotion from others. *Groupthink* is associated with *anger leads to isolation from the social group*. Participants, when they see another person's anger, may go along with that to isolate the victim from the group, excusing the aggressive anger due to a perceived wrong of the victim. *Forgiveness* is associated with *anger as an offensive reaction*, as is *perspective taking*. Participants engage in perspective taking when seeing others' anger to try to understand the situation and how to defuse it, and frequently they speak about "forgiveness" in order to make the conflict go away. It is rare that girls engage in the dialogue that will need to true forgiveness and change. Girls feeling *anger as an offensive emotion* also *confront* each other. The emotion associated with most action is *anger as an offensive reaction*. *Upstand* is once again associated with *positive upstanding emotion*. However, two girls avoid standing up for others in order to avoid the aggressor's anger. When

participants upstand, they focus on making the victim feel better or on avoiding becoming a target of anger, not on how they feel when they are helping someone else. Focusing girls on that positive emotion and connecting it to leadership may be an interesting way to encourage more bystanders to intervene on behalf of victims.

In eighth grade, girls engage in a lot of *perspective taking*, which appears to be triggered by various emotions. The other most common actions are *upstanding*, *confronting*, and *isolate*. Girls recognize that when others are *isolated*, they *feel bad or sad* (or the girls do themselves when they are isolated). Girls are triggered to *perspective take* when dealing with *anger* (all types). All types of *anger* also correspond with *confrontation*. More than half the instances of *isolation* are related to *anger*. Even though girls are loathe to engage in the “drama,” it appears that if they think it is appropriate, they will confront another person’s anger or they will upstand on behalf of a friend.

The prevalence of *perspective taking* across all four years is important because it shows that even when girls are not upstanding for each other, they are constantly thinking about what others are experiencing and how others may be perceiving them. The other relationships between emotion and action illustrate that when girls upstand, they may be motivated by a sense of compassion and feel positive after doing so. Moreover, especially in seventh grade, anger seems associated with individuals being isolated from the group, and for those individuals to thus feel bad or sad. Anger appears across the data, but can motivate various actions, including isolation, confrontation, and disengagement. This is further evidence that rather than reacting to a particular emotion in a singular way, girls are looking at the social situation and

engaging in perspective taking and downregulation, and then acting. This is a more System 2 approach to thinking through a moral problem. Girls may have an initial intuition or instinct (such as standing up for the person being bullied) but they engage in more reasoning before acting (rather than jumping in, they wait until the bully is gone and then comfort the victim). Thus, they can maintain the social fabric and do not risk their own place.

***Question five: What is the relationship between motivations and actions?***

To understand the relationship between motivations and actions, co-occurrences between motivation and action were examined for all four years (Tables 15-18 below). In fifth grade, there were 61 co-occurrences between motivation and action, and the frequencies ranged from 0 to 10. In sixth grade, there were 145 co-occurrences between motivation and action, and frequencies ranged from 0 to 24. In seventh grade, there were 83 co-occurrences between motivation and action, and the frequencies ranged from 0 to 8, and in eighth grade, there were 80 total co-occurrences and frequencies ranged from 0 to 10. Please note that the colors in the tables below do not have special significance; they were used sort high, medium, and low for the analysis, as before.



Table 15: Fifth Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action

Fifth Grade	Confront	Disengage (i	Engage in another behavior	Forget	Forgive	Group think	Ignore	Isolate	Perspective taking	Redirect group	Upstand	Upstand in order to maintain the	
Absolve self of responsibility	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
Maintain friendships	6		1	3	0	1	1	1	10	1	4	6	
Not fair	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Power (lack of compassion for	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Strong sense of self	0	1		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Torn between self and group	1	2		0	0	0	1	1	3	0	5	1	
Victim deserves it	0	0		0	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	
TOTALS:	9	3		1	3	0	2	2	6	17	1	10	7

61

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

Table 16: Sixth Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action

Sixth Grade	Confront	Disengage (i	Engage in another behavior	Forget	Forgive	Group think	Ignore	Isolate	Perspective taking	Redirect group	Upstand	Upstand in order to maintain the	
Absolve self of responsibility	2	1		1	1	0	7	2	1	1	0	1	0
Maintain friendships	5	0		0	4	2	0	1	1	16	0	1	1
Not fair	0	0		1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
Power (lack of compassion for	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
Strong sense of self	3	0		1	0	0	1	0	0	14	0	5	0
Torn between self and group	8	1		1	3	2	4	3	4	24	0	8	0
Victim deserves it	0	0		0	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0
TOTALS:	19	2		4	8	4	15	6	9	62	0	15	1

145

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

Table 17: Seventh Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action

Seventh Grade

	Confront	Disengage (;	Engage in another behavior	Forget	Forgive	Group think	Ignore	Isolate	Perspective taking	Redirect group	Upright	Upright in order to maintain the	
Absolve self of responsibility	2	1		1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	0
Maintain friendships	3	0		0	1	2	2	0	8	1	0	6	1
Not fair	1	0		0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
Power (lack of compassion for	1	0		0	1	2	4	0	5	0	0	1	0
Strong sense of self	2	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0
Torn between self and group	1	0		0	0	0	3	2	6	3	0	3	0
Victim deserves it	2	0		0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
TOTALS:	12	1		1	2	5	12	2	25	7	0	15	1

83

(N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

Table 18: Eighth Grade Co-occurrences of Motivation by Action

Eighth Grade

	Confront	Disengage (;	Engage in another behavior	Forget	Forgive	Group think	Ignore	Isolate	Perspective taking	Redirect group	Upright	Upright in order to maintain the	
Absolve self of responsibility	1	0		0	0	1	3	0	2	2	0	2	0
Maintain friendships	0	0		0	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	4	1
Not fair	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Power (lack of compassion for	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Strong sense of self	1	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	0
Torn between self and group	0	0		0	0	0	6	0	3	4	0	5	0
Victim deserves it	2	0		0	0	1	10	0	5	4	0	3	0
TOTALS:	4	0		0	0	2	22	0	12	20	1	18	1

80

N=number of co-occurrences for all participants combined)

The number of motivation and action co-occurrences in fifth grade ranged from 1 to 17. The most coded action was *perspective taking* (17), and the next number of coded actions was 10 (*upstand*) and 9 (*confront*). *Upstanding to maintain the friendship* was coded 7 times; thus, the actions performed most often were some type of upstanding and perspective taking. The most common motivation to perspective take was to *maintain friendship*, and maintaining friendships was also the motivation behind both types of upstanding. Despite the fact that they are motivated to *maintain friendships*, they are not willing to *forgive* or *forget*. Girls, however, will *confront* each other in order to *maintain friendships*. They *confront* to *maintain friendship*, they *perspective take* in order to *maintain friendship*, and they *upstand* in order to *maintain friendship*.

In sixth grade, girls used *perspective taking* 62 times (which is a jump from fifth grade). This is by far the most prevalent action seen in the data across all four years. *Being torn between oneself and others, having a strong sense of self*, and *maintaining friendships*, motivates *perspective taking*. Girls are pushing themselves to see things as others might see them:

Oh yeah, two of my best friends were in a fight because one of them thought that the other had done something to really change herself (I think it was something about a boy) she had changed herself round him and I was kind of mad at both of them for and they took it to this really extreme level where they weren't talking for a week and a half and I was kind of mad at both of them because I just wanted them to see that you can believe something and still not have to force it in your friend's face like you can think something and talk

about it in a calm manner and not just have to ignore the other person so I was kind of mad at both of them but in the end they worked it out (Participant 5, Interview 1, Year 4).

In this situation, participant 4 is frustrated that her friends cannot engage in emotional *downregulation* and *perspective taking*, and she is mad because she wants to maintain her friendships.

*Confrontation* in order to *maintain friendships* is also present, as is *confronting* when someone *feels torn*. There is still the same level as *upstanding* as in fifth grade. In sixth grade, girls begin to use *groupthink*, which is associated with *absolving the self of responsibility*. When they act as a group, they absolve themselves as responsibility, and they can use *perspective taking* in order to assess how the rest of the peer group feels and thus how they can feel.

In seventh grade, instead of taking perspective, girls begin to use isolating of each other. Girls talk about *perspective taking* only 7 times. Girls *isolate* others 25 times. The next common actions coded were *upstanding*, *confronting*, and *groupthink*. Girls both *isolate* each other and *upstand in order to maintain friendships*. Reflecting on a situation in which a mean girl had victimized her friend, participant 4 says, “we didn’t want to listen to that other girl, the mean girl...because we were just like we’re not going to do that because she’s our friend. But some people did do it so we just said we would ignore the other girl, the mean girl, and we were like trying to comfort the girl who had been excluded” (Interview 2, Year 3). In this example, isolating the mean girl is a way of upstanding for her friend and maintaining the more important friendship.

*Groupthink* and *isolation* are motivated by *power (lack of compassion)* for others, which may explain why *perspective taking* dropped off. They are not perspective taking to ignore—they are “sick of” the relational conflict and drama within the group. *Groupthink* was not used frequently in the younger years, but as participants aged and became more cognizant of social pressures, they excused more and more aggressive behavior. *Power* frequently came up in the hypothetical dilemmas, where Cassie (the hypothetical bully) was frequently seen as acting because she like bossing around others and did not care about Karen (the hypothetical victim). It came up less frequently in real-life dilemmas.

In eighth grade, the trend is that *isolation* and *groupthink* persist, but *perspective taking* is also on the rise—but only to the level of fifth grade. Girls use *perspective taking* in order to *maintain friendships*, and when *the victim deserves it*. *Perspective taking* is a balancing act between self and friends. *Upstanding* remains pretty constant across sixth, seventh, and eighth grade. *Groupthink* is very motivated by the *victim deserving it*, although girls also report feeling *torn*. Girls may be able to understand the perspective of the victim, but still decide that she deserves the negative actions of the group. *Upstanding* tends to be associated with *guilt, feeling awkward*, or *compassion*. Having a *strong sense of self* is associated with *perspective taking*, which suggests that as participants aged, they can intervene because they knew themselves and they knew their friends and they knew that it was right. Not all participants developed this sense of themselves over the four years of the study, but those who did were able to articulate qualities that they liked about themselves and also qualities that their friends could articulate about them.

Across all years, codes of *forgive, forget, redirect the group, or ignore are not used*. No actions within the realm of self-control are prevalent across all four years. The codes also indicate that girls in this study do not seem to hold onto their own perspective while taking the perspectives of others. *Shame* does not seem to be a motivator or associated with action in this data.

### ***Summary of Overall Findings***

Participants certainly use emotions when experiencing relational aggression, and most commonly they experience anger and guilt. As girls progress from fifth to eighth grade, they become more aware of their own and others' anger, and this awareness causes them to express less compassion toward victims of relational aggression. Girls use emotional awareness to navigate these relationships, and especially monitor their own and others' emotional states in order to regulate.

It seems that the emotion/action relationships suggested by Haidt (2003) were not found in this data. Although relationships exist between emotions and actions, those relationships were often mediated through participants' consideration of other, non-moral factors. Rather than evidencing System 1, intuitive thinking, participants instead engaged in thinking that was much more System 2, considering multiple perspectives and multiple factors before acting. Moreover, any action did not necessarily focus on the aggressor, but instead on the overall situation in an attempt to maintain social fabric and connection. Moreover, clear motivations for intervening (or not) do not emerge from the data; instead, the context is carefully considered before choices are made. The dominant emotion was anger, although this anger could not always be called moral. Guilt, shame, and embarrassment do not motivate action, and

while positive emotions such as compassion may motivate action, participants did not always intervene even if they felt compassion for a victim.

As discussed in the literature review, a clear pattern between emotion, cognition, and action does not emerge, although participants do evidence high sensitivity to these moral questions and are able to think through these issues in sophisticated ways. However, as suggested by Crick and Dodge (1996), non-moral factors also affect how participants interact with each other and how they engage in these interpersonal conflicts. One of the most interesting findings emerged during the creation of the coding manual, which was the development of the emotional awareness codes and the motivation codes. Both of these codes were important in contextualizing the relationship between emotions and actions and in understanding the processes through which participants made sense of their experiences.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

This study examined the constellation of moral and non-moral emotions that occur within the narratives of their experiences with relational aggression, and in their reflections on hypothetical and real situations involving such aggression. To do this, a coding manual was developed that drew from Haidt's emotion families and derived from grounded theory analysis. Examination of four years of longitudinal data of 11-15 girls in grades five through eight demonstrated a complex picture of emotional experiencing and development, and some interesting relationships between emotions, motivation to act, and moral action in relational aggression situations.

In summary, girls in this sample experience and express complex social negotiations and emotional manipulations in order to maintain their friendships and avoid social isolation. While there is a relationship between emotion and action, there are also several intervening factors that affect girls' action choices. In making these decisions, girls consider their friendships, their own self-confidence, and prior experiences. Moreover, consideration of these factors can lead to reconsideration of both emotions and judgments; girls can downregulate and also intensify emotions and make different judgment choices. Girls then judge their responsibility to upstand and evaluate their agency in the situation. This complex process leads to decisions to upstand or bystand, and girls report repeating it multiple times a day as they deal with various social conflicts. In longstanding social groups, like the girls that we studied, prior experiences with friends can also feed into decisions to act or not act and intensify or downregulate emotional responses. While girls maintain emotional



constellations around other-condemning and self-conscious emotions for all four years, the relationships between emotions and actions differ as girls age. Emotions clearly play an important role in how girls approach these conflicts, but there is significant interplay between emotion and cognition, a systemic process as suggested by Haste (2013) and others.

### ***Expression of Emotion***

Other-condemning emotions, such as anger, certainly spark many conflicts, although this is not *moral* anger (Haidt, 2003). Instead it is anger at being slighted, anger at the group, and anger at friends. Moral anger does occur and does spark action, but it does not occur as often as other types of anger. However, as the literature and the girls in this sample suggest, girls do experience large amounts of anger as they work their way through middle school. However, this is not generalized anger, but instead is anger at behavior within the social group, including anger at choices made by their friends. By eighth grade, they demonstrate awareness of adeptly managing their own and others' anger and encouraging others to stay out of conflicts not directly pertaining to their own experiences.

There seem to be two patterns related to anger. First, girls experience compassion and positive upstanding emotions in fifth and sixth grade, which transforms into anger by eighth grade. The other, expressed by the more aggressive girls, is expressing anger in the younger years, which changes into compassion and upstanding emotions by eighth grade. Both of these patterns, however, allow girls to maintain their friendships and connections to the social group. Girls in the first group do so by carefully controlling their own image and being aware of the anger of others

to avoid escalation of situations. Girls in the second group begin to stop their mean behavior and help others in order to get back in with friends who may have rejected them for their bullying.

Self-conscious emotions, such as guilt, seem to be something that occurs after the incident—girls reflect on the situation, and then feel guilty about it. In the hypothetical, across all four years, they report that Cassie and Dixie probably both felt guilty after the situation with Karen had occurred, but not in the moment. Shame and embarrassment remain interrelated throughout the study. Girls who witness another girl being shamed may be more likely to intervene in that conflict because shame is such a powerful emotion that the girls perceive as reflecting negatively on one's true self. Girls work to avoid shaming themselves and they correct their friends when needed in order to prevent the shame from spreading amongst the group. By eighth grade, girls show a hyper-awareness of social expectations for their group, and their awareness of these expectations causes girls to closely monitor their own and their friends' behaviors. Girls use isolation and shaming of their friends in order to enforce social expectations and hold the group together. As the case study of participant 2 illustrates, the rise in self-conscious emotions leads to less upstanding for others in order to avoid becoming the target. Girls feel that standing up for people who are not close friends will be "awkward."

Other-praising emotions, which include "positive upstanding emotion," do make girls feel validation for helping each other, but do not occur frequently, and on their own, do not seem to motivate upstanding as the girls age. In fifth grade, more girls express that they like to help their friends and they feel good when they do so,

but as they age and become both more self-conscious and more aware of others' anger, they stop upstanding and thus lose the connection to this positive emotion. In other words, the promise of feeling good does not motivate girls to help out. Connecting girls to these good feelings might be an effective target of educational intervention.

Other-suffering emotions, such as compassion, do not tend to spark action, except after the fact, as demonstrated by participant 2. When asked metacognitive questions (Schrader, 1988), they recognize that they reflect on past experiences when making decisions and dealing with their friends. These reflections become more and more important as the girls get older. Girls may feel compassion for a victim of relational aggression, but simply feeling this compassion does not guarantee bystander intervention. As demonstrated in our model (Matthews & Schrader, 2010), there are several other factors that girls consider when deciding whether or not to get involved. Compassion, however, especially in the earlier of the years of the study, can inspire “covert” helping behaviors, such as when girls comfort the victim after the bully has left the scene. Asking such question in the interview may have caused the result that there was this emergent category of emotional awareness in the girls’ interview data. Sensitizing them to reflecting on their thoughts and emotions could be a positive benefit of having participated in this study but could have also created an artifact in the data.

### ***Emotional Constellations***

As girls age from fifth to eighth grade, they seem to focus less on their compassion for others and more on avoiding anger by disengaging from situations. Contrary to what the literature might lead one to expect, significant co-occurrences of

motivation and guilt were not found. Girls in this study seem not motivated to act when they feel guilty, but they are willing to intervene to help themselves or their friends avoid embarrassment, which, as suggested by Haidt (2003), can be experienced more as shame within the interdependent social context. As participants moved from fifth through eighth grade, they were concerned about creating strong social groups and policing each other's behavior, especially as they prepared for the transition into high school.

In the analysis of girls' emotional constellations, it became clear that in addition to their moral sensitivity, participants also evidenced social intelligence (Goleman, 2007), especially as they developed more sophisticated perspective taking skills. Participants showed empathy (compassion) toward others and also demonstrated social facility in that they were intensely aware of how they presented themselves and how they fit within the overall social dynamic. While their moral sensitivity alerted participants that something was wrong, this social intelligence affected how they responded to situations of relational aggression. Participants who had both empathy and social facility were most successful in responding to the aggression without losing their friendship groups.

### ***Co-occurrences of Emotions, Awareness, Motivations, and Actions***

Emotional regulation may be especially important in relational aggression where interventions may depend on girls consciously restructuring and changing their emotions. Thompson (1994) defines emotional regulation as "the extrinsic and intrinsic processes responsible for monitoring, evaluating, and modifying emotional reactions, especially their intensive and temporal features, to accomplish one's goals"

(pp. 27-28). According to Harter (1999), there are three points of emotional regulation: 1) attending to antecedent conditions; 2) choosing how to appraise antecedent conditions; and 3) modulating emotional reactions to fit social desirability or other important aspects of self-definition (cf. Campos *et al.*, 1994). Thompson (1994) also describes several additional features of emotional regulation. First, while people may focus on and encourage the inhibition of emotion, they can also use emotional regulation strategies to enhance emotional arousal. Second, emotional regulation can involve self-management, but others also assist in regulating emotions. Third, emotional regulation may affect the emotion itself, regulatory strategies more often affect how long and how intensely emotion is experienced. Finally, emotional regulation should be considered in the context of an individual's goals within the social situation in which she is experiencing the emotion. The focus here is on how and individual uses regulation to reach one's social goals and how others are responding to one's actions and emotions (Campos *et al.*, 1994; Thompson, 1994). As girls within this study traversed middle school, they become more adept at emotional regulation and also more aware of how they manage their own and others' emotional states. However, these participants seemed also motivated by maintaining friendships and the social group. As suggested by Helion and Pizarro (2013) in the case of disgust, individuals may regulate their moral emotions in the same way in order to achieve non-moral goals, even if that regulation means feeling a negative emotion or not acting morally. In this analysis of these data this behavior is certainly present in the ways that girls downregulate and monitor their own and others' emotions.

Girls in this study demonstrated consistent concern about maintaining their

friendships, and as they get older, they become more adept at taking others' perspectives and using those perspectives to make decisions. Josselson (1998, 2007) studies how girls develop through their relationships with others. In particular, Josselson (1998, 2007) looks at the dynamic interaction in the space between individuals—how we create the individuals with whom we have relationships. In mapping these relationships to understand how they affect an individual's sense of identity, Josselson (2007) argues “the ‘individual’...becomes a product of a relational network that finds and creates, is found and created by, the others in the system, in an endless flow of mutual interaction” (p. 133). In fact, the action most closely associated with any emotion was perspective taking, by far. Girls spend a lot of time monitoring their emotions across all four years, but their self-control increases over the years as they become significantly better at controlling their own emotional reactions and at deciding when and how to get involved with others. They increasingly use perspective taking as a tool to assess how others might be feeling and to decide how to act. In fact, when girls feel paralyzed by emotional awareness of others' emotions, they often engage in perspective taking to assess how their friends and others involved in the situation feel before deciding how to act.

In the hypothetical Relational Aggression dilemma, all the girls across all four years talk about Cassie feeling powerful and feeling happy that she excluded Karen, However, they never identify those emotions in the real-life dilemma—the archetypical bully does not exist in these girls' experiences. While girls can empathize with the players in the dilemma, they do not see these clear roles in their own experiences. Even when they identify situations in which one girl is being mean to

another girl, they can see nuance within the conflicts and do not see the bully as the “happy victimizer” that they perceive Cassie as. The disconnect between hypothetical and real-life experiences suggests that girls experience the roles in relational aggression as fluid and constantly shifting depending on context and actors (Schrader & Matthews, 2008). Because of the highly contextual nature in which girls experience relational aggression, they do not see themselves as bullies. In fact, when asked specifically about being a bully, many girls report not ever acting in that way or they find ways to minimize their behavior.

Ultimately, a strong relationship between specific emotions and actions was not found, as would have been suggested by Haidt (2003) and others. Instead, girls in this study are considering multiple factors, both moral and non-moral, when deciding to intervene in situations of relational aggression. Participants were focused primarily on maintaining their social group, and to achieve this goal, they used multiple strategies to regulate their own and others’ emotions, including perspective taking.

### ***Theoretical Implications***

This analysis provides an in-depth look at the emotions that girls experience and how they manage those emotions when making decisions as to how to act in situations of relational aggression. There is an extensive overlap between cognition and emotion when girls are making decisions. When reasoning through and reflecting on their dilemmas, girls focus on how their actions will make others’ feel, not what the principled stand might be. Girls will acknowledge that they know the right thing to do, but they may do something else if it means maintaining friendships and avoiding harm. Unless specifically prompted, most girls do not refer to the idea that something

is “right” or “wrong” to do when dealing with conflicts with their friends (although on the rare occasions when moral anger is evoked, it is evoked because of perceived violations of fairness).

Girls do have the ability to use more principled reasoning when dealing with relational aggression, but they use this reasoning only when discussing hypothetical dilemmas. For example, many of the girls, when asked what Karen, the victim in the Cassie dilemma should do, report that she should confront her friends, and that if her friends did not listen to her, then she should walk away and find new friends. This response directly contradicts what girls do when they are hurt by a friend. For the most part, girls disengage from the bully and use a variety of techniques to downregulate their emotions. As bystanders, when they see conflict, rather than upstanding on a regular basis, girls tend to ignore the situation and comfort the victim after the fact. Girls understand the cultural narrative that says they are supposed to be confident in who they are and should stand up to their friends, and they give that response when speaking in hypotheticals. When dealing with their own lives, however, girls are much more aware of their own and others’ feelings and how to maintain social standing. It’s much more threatening to risk their friendships based on principle.

Overall, these conflicts are less about specific emotion/action relationships and more about smoothing and controlling emotions. Girls use their emotional reactions as an indicator that something might be wrong and that their friends are angry and monitor and control those emotions closely in order to manage the conflict and maintain their friendships. They do this through using perspective taking. When they are younger, they seem concerned about making sure that no one is hurt. As they get



older, they are more concerned about their friends, and in year four they also begin to develop a strong awareness that how their friends act reflects on them as well and start gate-keeping behavior much more frequently. The emotions are like canaries in the coal mine; they trigger a warning that something might be wrong in their friendships and that must be fixed. Frequently, when these feelings are in the self, girls disengage and deal with them, but rarely do they confront. In a sense, emotions are like social/relational sensitivity; like moral sensitivity, they indicate that there is a problem that must be dealt with immediately. How it is dealt with depends on a wide variety of factors, including things like social standing and group hierarchy and whether you/the victim may have done something to “deserve” correction.

These data also show that girls are using System 2 reasoning in deciding how to respond to relational aggression and conflicts between their friend groups. While they certainly have System 1 intuitions, girls are adept at controlling those reactions, especially as they get older. Specifically, girls use their skills at perspective taking—it is the action most commonly associated with all emotions—to figure out what their friends are thinking, and then they react with that information in mind. In other words, while emotions are important information, they do not drive the reaction in these interpersonal situations.

The analyses conducted here also reveal interesting information about relational aggression. As we have suggested in previous work (Schrader & Matthews, 2008), most girls do not fit into clear roles as Wiseman (2003) has suggested. Instead, girls’ roles and actions change based on the actors within the situation. Furthermore, girls are more likely to stand up for someone who they do not perceive as deserving

the aggression of the group than they are for friends who have transgressed against the group. For example, participant 2 discusses calling out her friends for using the word “gay” as a slur. When asked why she had the confidence to stand up for her beliefs, she replied that she knew that she was right, and she was confident that her friends would not turn against her. However, participant 2 also reports staying silent as a bystander and feeling torn when friends were fighting. How can we reconcile these divergent responses? It appears that with the generalized principle, much like with the hypothetical RA dilemma, girls believe that their friends will stand with them, even if they disagree with the group. Girls can identify what the moral action is and will do that action. Whether that is due to emotion, perspective taking or reasoning, or some other variable, is for further research and not examined systematically in this study.

However, when dealing with interpersonal dilemmas that threaten the interpersonal self, girls seem much more hesitant to risk rupture with the group. As Kegan (1982) points out, individuals in stage three of his developmental model see themselves as mutually intertwined with others. They cannot separate their sense of self from their peers. The girls in our data set all fit into this developmental stage, and most of them recognize that they would not be who they are without their friends. By middle school, they acknowledge that they would “still exist” without their friends, but they cannot conceptualize how they would be without their friends. Choosing sides in a personal conflict forces a girl to split from her friends, and most of them avoid this choice whenever possible.

### ***Practical Implications***

This study illustrates the interrelationship between emotions and cognition when girls are dealing with interpersonal relationships. Participants were not only aware of their emotions, but they used this awareness, along with their social intelligence, to make action choices that maintained friendships with both the aggressor and the victim. While some of these choices may seem immoral, in many ways this study demonstrates that morality does indeed “bind and blind” (Haidt, 2013). What this study suggests is that working with girls within their social contexts and on their emotional responses to relational aggression may be the best way to intervene in these situations. The goal of this work would not be to encourage girls to disengage from each other, but instead to get them to deeply experience their emotional states and reflect before reacting. This mindfulness approach, while Buddhist in origin, has become increasingly popular in therapeutic contexts as a way of engaging individuals with their emotions and training them to acknowledge those emotions before reacting. While the girls in this sample engage in some of this reflection already, further explorations of the way to deal with these emotions in a productive way could be taught and discussed. Teaching girls to be mindful and aware of how they feel and how they react to and attach themselves to their emotional states may be a useful strategy in getting them to think about how they act in conflict and how they manipulate conflict. Rather than using conflicts as a weapon against each other, girls may be less invested in their emotional states and more invested in transforming the emotion.

It also may be fruitful to engage girls in how to construct and transform their school environments to create a more caring community. Girls tolerate a lot of negative behaviors from each other and from themselves, and teaching them how to engage with each other and move toward a “just community” (Power, 2004). Girls do report feeling positive when they upstand for each other, and creating a community where such positive upstanding is a norm may encourage the development of such behavior and the accompanying positive affect (Krettenauer *et al.*, 2011). Encouraging girls to speak out in praise of each other’s prosocial behavior may also change the tone of the school community and encourage girls to stand up for each other and for themselves in more constructive ways.

Clearly, more research on targeted interventions is needed before concrete educational suggestions can be made. This study and the larger project from which it derives, however, are an important first steps in better understanding how girls understand relational aggression and how they understand it in moral terms. As discussed, this study has better illuminated how girls think about moral emotions and how they use these emotions to make decisions in their interpersonal conflicts.

### ***Suggestions for Further Research***

Given that this is a small, qualitative study, there are limits to how generalizable these results are. Repeating this study with a more diverse sample of girls would allow for further development and refinement of the coding manual, as well as better articulation of a possible developmental model and educational intervention. While increasing mindfulness and engaging girls in conversations about relational aggression and bullying may be useful in raising awareness, development

and social pressures may prevent girls from using these tools successfully to change the social atmosphere. Further research will be needed to better develop a model of how girls use emotion and other factors in making decisions when dealing with relational aggression, although these findings suggest that girls are acting more deliberately than intuitively and are using sophisticated strategies of emotional regulation and perspective taking when negotiating these conflicts.

This dissertation focused on moral emotions in relational aggression situations because of the connections between these emotions and moral actions. Understanding how girls consider their emotions when choosing actions could lead to both a better understanding of moral emotions' role in moral decision-making and how we can teach girls to use their emotional awareness to make more moral decisions. In the field of moral psychology, moral emotions have been gaining prominence as an area of focus and study. While my work does not focus on intuitions or automatic emotional responses, it does focus on emotional metareflective states and emotional regulation. This is not an area of emotions that has been deeply considered in work on moral emotions and how they influence behavior. However, if emotions drive/influence moral judgments and moral actions as much as has been recently suggested in the literature, understanding both how individuals experience those emotions *and* how they regulate them has interesting implications for how individuals make moral judgments and choose what moral behavior (or not) in which to engage. Individuals can regulate their moral emotions if they are conscious of these emotions; so understanding how that is done helps us better understand how moral emotions affect moral judgments and moral actions.

Emotions are essential to how we understand ourselves as individuals. As Blasi (1999) argued, the regulation of moral emotion and how we present ourselves to others may be a key component of how we construct a moral identity. Blasi (1980) suggested that the moral self is a bridge between our moral judgments and moral actions; to not act in accordance with our judgments is to betray the self. The question has thus arisen: How does the moral self develop? Why do some individuals develop moral identities and others do not? Understanding how individuals regulate their emotions and present themselves to others may be key to understanding how they develop moral identities. This dissertation is an important step toward conceptualizing a developmental model of moral identity development in adolescence.

A part of the development of this model may be further research into the bullying role. The original study (Schrader, 2005) asked girls to discuss being a bully, a bystander, and a victim. While girls were easily able to discuss the bystander and victim roles, they did not articulate a clear sense of themselves as engaging in bullying behavior, even when their behavior appeared aggressive to the interviewer. A closer analysis of this data, as well as follow-up interviews, may be useful in understanding how girls conceptualize bullying and how they fit this behavior into their self-understandings and their conceptions of morality.

This work has connections to the nascent literature on mindfulness and self-compassion, both of which integrate Buddhist principles into western psychology to suggest that we can assist individuals in training their emotional responses and reactions and thus reshape how they think about problems in their lives and how they emotionally experience those problems and then act in subsequent situations.

Teaching students to be more present and mindful of their emotional states will hopefully make them more compassionate and moral individuals, which, I believe, is a central aim of education.

## REFERENCES

- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(3), 212-230.
- Arnold, M. L. (1993). *The place of morality in the adolescent self*. Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Baer, R. A., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., Smith, G. T., & Toney, L. (2006). Using Self-Report Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. *Assessment*, 13(1), 27-45.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31, 101-119.
- Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 29(10), 1207-1220.
- Barrett, K., & Campos, J. (1987). Perspectives on emotional development II: A functionalist approach to emotions In J. Osofsky (Ed.), *Handbook of infant development* (2nd ed., pp. 555-578). New York: Wiley.
- Barrett, L. F., Mesquita, B., Ochsner, K. N., & Gross, J. J. (2007). The experience of emotion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 373-403.
- Baumeister, R. F., Stillwell, A. M., & Heatherton, T. F. (1994). Guilt: An interpersonal approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 243-267.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., DeWall, C. N., & Zhang, L. (2007). How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection rather than direct causation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11, 167-203.
- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N. & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Benetti-McQuoid, J., & Bursik, K. (2005). Individual differences in experiences of and responses to guilty and shame: Examining the lenses of gender and gender role. *Sex Roles*, 53(1/2), 133-142.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 117-127.



- Bjorkqvist, K., & Niemela, P. (1992). New trends in the study of female aggression. In K. Bjorkqvist & P. Niemela (Eds.), *Of mice and women: Aspects of female aggression*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 1-45.
- Blasi, A. (1983). Moral cognition and moral action: A theoretical perspective. *Developmental Review*, 3, 178-210.
- Blasi, A. (1984). Moral identity: Its role in moral functioning. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blasi, A. (1988). Identity and the development of the self. In D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Self, ego and identity: Integrative approaches* (pp. 226-242). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Blasi, A. (1999). Emotions and moral motivation. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 29(1), 1-19.
- Blasi, A. (2005). Moral character: A psychological approach. In D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Character psychology and character education* (pp. 18-35). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, L. (1997). Performing Femininities: Listening to white working-class girls in rural Maine. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53(4), 683-701.
- Brown, L., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, L. (2003). *Girlfighting: Betrayal and rejection among girls*. New York: New York University Press.
- Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1991). Listening for voice in narratives of relationship. In M. Tappan & M. Packer (Eds.), *Narrative and storytelling: Implications for understanding moral development* (Vol. 54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campos, J., Campos, R., & Barrett, K. (1989). Emergent themes in the study of emotional development and emotion regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, 25, 393-402.

- Campos, J., Mumme, D., Kermoian, R., & Campos, R. (1994). A functionalist perspective on the nature of emotion. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2-3), 284-303.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Cermak, I., & Rosza, S. (2001). Facing guilt: Role of negative affectivity, need for reparation, and fear of punishment in leading to prosocial behaviour and aggression. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 219-237.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Cermak, I., & Rosza, S. (2001). Facing guilt: Role of negative affectivity, need for reparation, and fear of punishment in leading to prosocial behaviour and aggression. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 219-237.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Pine Forge Press.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). Criminalizing victimization: The unintended consequences of pro-arrest policies for girls and women. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2, 18-23.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Irwin, K. (2008). *Beyond bad girls: Gender, violence, and hype*. New York: Routledge.
- Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1992). *Some do care: Contemporary lives of moral commitment*. New York: The Free Press.
- Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). *The measurement of moral judgment: Theoretical foundations and research validation* (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coles, R. (1986). *The moral life of children*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Conroy, J. (2004). *Betwixt and between: The liminal imagination, education and democracy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cox, D. L., Stabb, S. D., & Hulgus, J. F. (2000). Anger and depression in girls and boys. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 110-112.
- Crick, N., & Dodge, K. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms in reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development*, 67, 993-1002.
- Crick, N. R. (1995). Relational aggression: The role of intent attributions, feelings of distress, and provocation type. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 313-322.
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(1), 74-101.

- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1996). Children's treatment by peers: Victims of relational and overt aggression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8, 367-380.
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. P. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-722.
- Crick, N. R., Nelson, D. A., Morales, J. R., Cullerton-Sen, C., Casas, J. F., & Hickman, S. (2001). Relational victimization in childhood and adolescence: I hurt you through the grapevine. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 196-214). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Crick, N. R., Ostrov, J. M., & Werner, N. E. (2006). A longitudinal study of relational aggression, physical aggression, and children's social-psychological adjustment. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34, 131-142.
- Crick, N. R., Werner, N. E., Casas, J. F., O'Brien, K. M., Nelson, D. A., Grotpeter, J. K., *et al.* (1999). Childhood aggression and gender: A new look at an old problem. In R. A. Dienstbier & D. Bernstein (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Gender and motivation* (pp. 75-141). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. New York: Putnam.
- Damon, W. (1984). Self-understanding and moral development from childhood to adolescence. In W. M. Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Morality, moral behavior, and moral development*. New York: John Wiley.
- Decety, J., Michalska, K. J., & Kinzler, K. D. (2012). The contribution of emotion and cognition to moral sensitivity: a neurodevelopmental study. *Cerebral Cortex*, 22(1), 209-220.
- DeVault, M. L., & Gross, G. (2007). Feminist interviewing: Experience, talk, and knowledge. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dodge, K. A. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. *Child Development*, 51, 162-170.
- Dodge, K. A. (1993). Social-cognitive mechanisms in the development of conduct disorder and depression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 559-584.
- Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social-information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1146-1158.

- Dodge, K. A., & Pettit, G. S. (2003). A biopsychosocial model of the development of chronic conduct problems in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(2), 349-371.
- Dodge, K. A., Lansford, J. E., Burks, V. S., Bates, J. E., Pettit, G. S., Fontaine, R., & Price, J. M. (2003). Peer rejection and social information-processing factors in the development of aggressive behavior problems in children. *Child development*, 74(2), 374-393.
- Duncan, S., & Barrett, L. F. (2007). Affect as a form of cognition: A neurobiological analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 21, 1184-1211.
- Ekman, P., Davidson, R. J., Ricard, M., & Wallace, B. A. (2005). Buddhist and psychological perspectives on emotions and well-being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(2), 59-63.
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual review of psychology*, 51(1), 665-697.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Ettxebarria, I., & Apodaca, P. (2008). Both Freud and Hoffman are right: Anxious-aggressive and empathic dimensions of guilt. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(1), 159-171.
- Farrell, A. D., Kung, E. M., White, K. S., & Valois, R. F. (2000). The structure of self-reported aggression, drug use, and delinquent behaviors during early adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 29, 282-292.
- Farrington, D. P. (2003). Developmental and life-course criminology: Key theoretical and empirical issues--the 2002 Sutherland Award address. *Criminology*, 41(2), 221-255.
- Frijda, N. H. (1993). The place of appraisal in emotion. In N. H. Frijda (Ed.), *Appraisal and Beyond. The issue of cognitive determinants of emotion* (pp. 357-387). Hove, UK: Erlbaum.
- Frimer, J. A., & Walker, L. J. (2009). Reconciling the self and morality: An empirical model of moral centrality development. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(6), 1669-1681.
- Galen, B. R., & Underwood, M. K. (1997). A developmental investigation of social aggression among children. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(4), 589-600.

- Gannon, S., & Davies, B. (2006). Postmodern, poststructural and critical perspectives. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist Research: Theory and Praxis* (pp. 71-106). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Garbarino, J. (2006). *See Jane hit: Why girls are growing more violent and what we can do about it*. New York: The Penguin Group.
- Garcia, A. E. V., & Ostrosky-Solis, F. (2006). From morality to moral emotions. *International Journal of Psychology*, 41(5), 348-354.
- Gibbs, J. C., Basinger, K. S., Grime, R. L., & Snarey, J. R. (2007). Moral judgment development across cultures: Revisiting Kohlberg's universality claims. *Developmental Review*, 27(4), 443-500.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., & Brown, L. M. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology, girls' development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gini, G. (2006). Social cognition and moral cognition in bullying: What's wrong? *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(6), 528-539.
- Goleman, D. (2007). *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (2011). *The brain and emotional intelligence: New insights*. Northampton, MA: More than Sounds LLC.
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Koleva, S., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Mapping the moral domain. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 101, 366-385.
- Greene, S. (2003). *The psychological development of girls and women: Rethinking change in time*. New York: Routledge.
- Greene, J. D., Nystrom, L. E., Engell, A. D., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2004). The neural bases of cognitive conflict and control in moral judgment. *Neuron*, 44(2), 389-400.
- Greene, J. D. (2008). The secret joke of Kant's soul. In W. Sinnott-Armstrong (Ed.), *Moral psychology. The neuroscience of morality: Emotion, brain disorders, and development* (3, pp. 35-80). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research* (pp. 195-220). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Vol. I*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: A social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108, 814-834.
- Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer & H. H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective sciences* (pp. 852-870). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haidt, J. (2007). The new synthesis in moral psychology. *Science*, 316(5827), 998-1002.
- Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Haidt, J. (2013). Moral psychology for the twenty-first century. *Journal of Moral Education* 42(3), 281-297.
- Hart, D. (2005). Adding identity to the moral domain. *Human Development*, 48, 257-261.
- Hart, D., & Fegley, S. (1995). Prosocial behavior and caring in adolescence: Relations to self-understanding and social judgment. *Child Development*, 66(5), 1346-1359.
- Harter, S. (1999). *The construction of self*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Haste, H. (1990). Moral responsibility and moral commitment: The integration of affect and cognition. In T. Wren (Ed.), *The Moral Domain* (pp. 315-359). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Haste, H., & Abrahams, S. (2008). Morality, culture, and the dialogic self: Taking cultural pluralism seriously. *Journal of Moral Education*, 37(3), 377-394.
- Haste, H. (2013). Deconstructing the elephant and the flag in the lavatory: Promises and problems of moral foundations research. *Journal of Moral Education*, 42(3), 316-329.
- Hatch, H., & Forgays, D. K. (2001). A comparison of older adolescent and adult females' responses to anger-provoking situations. *Adolescence*, 36(143), 557-570.
- Hauser, M. D. (2006). *Moral minds: The nature of right and wrong*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

- Haynie, D. L. (2003). Contexts of risk? Explaining the link between girls' pubertal development and their delinquency involvement. *Social Forces*, 82(1), 355-397.
- Helion, C. & Pizarro, D.A. (2013). Beyond dual-processes: The interplay of reason and emotion in moral judgment. Draft submitted for inclusion in N. Levy & Clausen, J. (Eds.) *Springer Handbook for Neuroethics*.
- Helzer, E. G., & Pizarro, D. A. (2011). Dirty liberals! Reminders of physical cleanliness influence moral and political attitudes. *Psychological science*, 22(4), 517-522.
- Hoffman, M. L. (1998). Varieties of empathy-based guilt. In J. Bybee (Ed.), *Guilt and children* (pp. 91-112). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Inbar, Y., Pizarro, D.A., Iyer, R., & Haidt, J. (2012). Disgust sensitivity, political conservatism, and voting. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3, 537-544.
- Jackson, M. A. (2004). Race, gender, and aggression: The impact of sociocultural factors on girls. In M. M. Moretti, C. L. Odgers & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Girls and aggression: Contributing factors and intervention principles* (pp. 85-99). New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Josselson, R. (1998). *Revising herself: The story of women's identity from college to midlife*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Josselson, R. (2007). *Playing Pygmalion: How people create one another*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Kahneman, D. (2003). A perspective on judgment and choice: Mapping bounded rationality. *American Psychologist*, 58(9), 697-720.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Macmillan.
- Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1973). On the psychology of prediction. *Psychological Review* 80(4), 237-251.
- Karriker-Jaffe, K. J., Foshee, V. A., Ennett, S. T., & Suchindran, C. (2008). The development of aggression during adolescence: Sex differences in trajectories of physical and social aggression among youth in rural areas. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36, 1227-1236.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought: How to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In T. Mischel (Ed.), *Cognitive development*

- and epistemology* (pp. 151-234). New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (1998). *Methods of education and social science research: An integrated approach* (2 ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Krettenauer, T., Jia, F., & Mosleh, M. (2011). The role of emotional expectancies in adolescents' moral decision making. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 108, 358-370.
- Krettenauer, T., & Johnston, M. (2010). Positively versus negatively charged moral emotion expectancies in adolescence: The role of situational context and the developing moral self. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*.
- Krettenauer, T., Malti, T., & Sokol, B. W. (2008). The development of moral emotion expectancies and the happy victimizer phenomenon: A critical review of theory and application. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 2(3), 221-235.
- Kubany, E. S., & Watson, S. B. (2003). Guilt: Elaboration of a multidimensional model. *Psychological Record*, 53, 51-90.
- Laible, D., Eye, J., & Carlo, G. (2008). Dimensions of conscience in mid-adolescence: Links with social behavior, parenting, and temperament. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 875-887.
- Lapsley, D. K. (1996). *Moral psychology*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Lapsley, D. K. (2009). Implicit moral reasoning and the integration of emotion and cognition. In W. A. Sinott-Armstrong (Ed.), *Moral psychology, Vol. 2, The cognitive science of morality*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lapsley, D. K., & Narvaez, D. (2004). A social-cognitive approach to the moral personality. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lave, J. (1991). Situating learning in communities of practice. *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*, 2, 63-82.
- Leadbeater, B., & Way, N. (Eds.). (1996). *Urban girls: Resisting stereotypes, creating identities*. New York: New York University Press.



- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Barquissau, M. (2004). The evocation of moral emotions in intergroup contexts: The distinction between collective guilt and collective shame. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosle (Eds.), *Collective guilt: International perspectives* (pp. 35-55). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., Curtis, M., Scarnier, M., & Ames, D. R. (2005). Vicarious shame and guilt. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 8, 145-147.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Spanovic, M. (2006). Group-conscious emotions: The implications of others' wrongdoings for identity and relationships. In R. Robins, J. Tracy & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Loeber, R., & Hay, D. (1997). Key issues in the development of aggression and violence from childhood to early adulthood. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48, 371-410.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2004). Aggression in the context of gender development. In M. Putallaz & K. L. Bierman (Eds.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls: A developmental perspective* (pp. 3-22). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Malti, T., & Keller, M. (2010). The development of moral emotions in a cultural context. In W. Arsenio & E. Lemerise (Eds.), *Emotions, aggression, and morality in children: Bridging development and psychopathology*, (pp. 177-198). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Malti, T., & Latzko, B. (2010). Children's moral emotions and moral cognition: Towards an integrative perspective. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 2010(129), 1-10.
- Malti, T., Gasser, L., & Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E. (2010). Children's interpretive understanding, moral judgments, and emotion attributions: Relations to social behaviour. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 28(2), 275-292.
- Malti, T., Killen, M., & Gasser, L. (2012). Social judgments and emotion attributions about exclusion in Switzerland. *Child Development*, 83(2), 697-711.
- Malti, T., & Krettenauer, T. (2012). The Relation of Moral Emotion Attributions to Prosocial and Antisocial Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Child development*.
- Marcus, G. F. (2004). *The birth of the mind: How a tiny number of genes creates the complexities of human thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mathieson, K., & Banerjee, R. (2011). Peer play, emotion understanding, and socio-moral

- explanation: The role of gender. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 29(2), 188-196.
- Matthews, J. (2007). Concepts of the relationship between moral cognition and moral emotions. Unpublished Course Paper. Cornell University.
- Maxwell, J. (2004). Causal explanation, qualitative research, and scientific inquiry in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2), 3-11.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyers, D. T. (Ed.). (1997). *Feminists rethink the self*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100(4), 674-701.
- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). *Sex differences in antisocial behaviour: Conduct disorder, delinquency, and violence in the Dunedin longitudinal study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moll, J. (2008). *Neuroscience and morality: Moral judgments, sentiments, and values*. Paper presented at the 2008 Notre Dame Symposium on the Moral Personality.
- Molnar, B. E., Browne, A., Cerda, M., & Buka, S. L. (2005). Violent behavior by girls reporting violent victimization. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 159, 731-739.
- Moretti, M. M., DaSilva, K., & Holland, R. (2004). Aggression and violence from an attachment perspective: Gender issues and therapeutic implications. In M. M. Moretti, C. Odgers & Jackson (Eds.), *Girls and aggression: Contributing factors and intervention principles*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Moretti, M. M., Odgers, C. L., & Jackson, M. A. (2004). Girls and aggression: A point of departure. In M. M. Moretti, C. L. Odgers & M. A. Jackson (Eds.), *Girls and aggression: Contributing factors and intervention principles* (pp. 1-6). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Moretti, M. M., Odgers, C. L., & Jackson, M. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Girls and aggression: Contributing factors and intervention principles*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Moshman, D. (2004). False moral identity: Self-serving denial in the maintenance of moral self-conceptions. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity* (pp. 83-110). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Muuss, R. E. (1996). *Theories of adolescence* (6 ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

- Narvaez, D., & Bock, T. (2002). Moral schemas and tacit judgment or how the defining issues test is supported by cognitive science. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(3), 297-314.
- Narvaez, D., & Lapsley, D. K. (Eds.). (2009). *Moral personality, identity, and character: An interdisciplinary future*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Neff, K. D. (2003a). Development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and Identity*, 2, 223-250.
- Neff, K. D. (2003b). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity*, 2, 85-101.
- Neff, K. D. (2008). Self-compassion. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ness, C. D. (2010). Why girls fight: Female violence in inner cities. *Dissertations available from ProQuest*. Paper AAI3414224.  
<http://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI3414224>
- Nucci, L. (2001). *Education in the moral domain*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nucci, L. (2004). Reflections on the moral self construct. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity* (pp. 111-132). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nucci, L., & Turiel, E. (2007). *Development in the moral domain: The role of conflict and relationships in children's and adolescents' welfare and harm judgments*. Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development.
- Nunner-Winkler, G., & Sodian, B. (1988). Children's understanding of moral emotions. *Child Development*, 59, 1323-1338.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2001). *Upheavels of thought: The intelligence of emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Odgers, C. L., & Moretti, M. M. (2002). Aggressive and antisocial girls: Research update and challenges. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 1(2), 103-119.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Otto, R. (1958). *The idea of the holy* (J. W. Harvey, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Owens, L., Shute, R., & Slee, P. (2000). "Guess what I just heard!": Indirect aggression among teenage girls in Australia. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26, 67-83.
- Peled, M., & Moretti, M. M. (2007). Rumination on anger and sadness in adolescence: Fueling of fury and deepening of despair. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 36(1), 66-75.
- Penuel, W., & Wertsch, J. (1995). Vygotsky and identity formation: A sociocultural approach. *Educational Psychologist*, 30, 83-92.
- Pepler, D., Craig, W., Yuile, A., & Connolly, J. (2004). Girls who bully: A developmental and relational perspective. In M. Putallaz & K. L. Bierman (Eds.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls: A developmental perspective* (pp. 90-109). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Piaget, J. (1932). *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York: Norton.
- Pizarro, D. (2000). Nothing more than feelings? The role of emotion in moral judgment. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30, 355-375.
- Pizarro, D. A., & Bloom, P. (2003). The intelligence of the moral intuitions: A comment on Haidt (2001). *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 193-196.
- Power, F. C. (2004). The moral self in community. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity* (pp. 47-64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Putallaz, M., & Bierman, K. L. (Eds.). (2004). *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls: A developmental perspective*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Rawls, J. (1972). *A theory of justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rayner, K. E., Schniering, C. A., Rapee, R. M., Taylor, A., & Hutchinson, D. M. (2013). Adolescent girls' friendship networks, body dissatisfaction, and disordered eating: Examining selection and socialization processes. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 122(1), 93.
- Roecker-Phelps, C. E. (2001). Children's responses to overt and relational aggression. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 20, 240-252.
- Rogoff, B. E., & Lave, J. E. (1984). *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context*. Harvard University Press.

- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. Oxford University Press.
- Rozin, P., & Haidt, J. (2013). The domains of disgust and their origins: contrasting biological and cultural evolutionary accounts. *Trends in cognitive sciences*.
- Russell, J. A. (2003). Core affect and psychological construction of emotion. *Psychological Review*, 110(1), 145-172.
- Saarni, C. (1993). Socialization of emotion. In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 435-446). New York: Guilford Press.
- Scarry, E. (1987). *The body in pain: The making and unmaking of the world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schrader, D. E. (1988). *Exploring metacognition: A description of levels of metacognition and their relation to moral judgment*. Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Schrader, D. E. (2005). Social aggression in adolescent girls: Bystander behavior and the development of moral integrity and action. Ithaca, NY: United States Department of Agriculture Hatch Grant.
- Schrader, D. E., Greenstone, J., Matthews, J., Mangiere, N., & Gouveia, C. (2006). *Bystander behavior: Girls' definitions and perceptions of social aggression*. Paper presented at the Association for Moral Education.
- Schrader, D. E. (2008, March). Toward a new model of development and change in moral development theory. Presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research in Adult Development, New York, NY.
- Schrader, D. E., & Matthews, J. (2008). *Challenges and opportunities for adolescent girls' relationships: Relational aggression and the roles girls play*. Paper presented at the Jean Piaget Society.
- Schrader, D. E. (2011). Book Review: Why Girls Fight: Female Youth Violence in the Inner City. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35(4), 646-647.
- Selman, R. (2003). *The promotion of social awareness: Powerful lessons from the partnership of developmental theory and classroom practice*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding: Developmental and clinical analysis*. New York: Academic Press.
- Selman, R. L., & Schultz, L. (1990). *Making a friend in youth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Sherman, G. D., & Haidt, J. (2011). Cuteness and disgust: The humanizing and dehumanizing effects of emotion. *Emotion Review*, 3(3), 245-251.
- Silfver, M., & Helkama, K. (2007). Empathy, guilt, and gender: A comparison of two measures of guilt. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 239-246.
- Simmons, R. (2002). *Odd girl out: The hidden culture of aggression in girls*. Orlando: Harcourt Books.
- Smith, H., & Thomas, S. P. (2000). Violent and nonviolent girls: Contrasting perceptions of anger experiences, school, and relationships. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 21, 547-575.
- Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7(4), 349-367.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Sullivan, T. N., Helms, S. W., Kliewer, W., & Goodman, K. L. (2010). Associations between sadness and anger regulation coping, emotional expression, and physical and relational aggression among urban adolescents. *Social Development*, 19(1), 30-51.
- Swaim, R. C., Henry, K. L., & Kelly, K. (2006). Predictors of aggressive behaviors among rural middle school youth. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 27(3), 229-243.
- Tamir, M. (2009). What do people want to feel and why? Pleasure and utility in emotion regulation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18(2), 101-105.
- Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 598-607.
- Tangney, J. P. (1996). Conceptual and methodological issues in the assessment of shame and guilt. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 34, 741-754.
- Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. H. (1996). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(6), 1256-1269.
- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 345-372.

- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 669-675.
- Tappan, M. B. (2000). Autobiography, mediated action, and the development of moral identity. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10(1), 81-109.
- Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation: A theme in search of definition. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(2-3), 25-52, 250-282.
- Uhlmann, E.L., Pizarro, D.A., Tannenbaum, D., & Ditto, P.H. (2009). The motivated use of moral principles. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 4, 479-491.
- Underwood, M. K. (1997). Peer social status and children's social choices about the expression and control of positive and negative emotions. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43, 610-634.
- Underwood, M. K. (2003). *Social aggression among girls*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Underwood, M. K., Hurley, J. C., Johanson, C. A., & Mosley, J. E. (1999). An experimental, observational investigation of children's responses to peer provocation: Developmental and gender differences in middle childhood. *Child Development*, 70(6), 1428-1446.
- Verbeek, P. (2006). Everyone's monkey: Primate moral roots. In M. Killen & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Verlaan, P. (2005). Commentary: The importance of social context and relationships in female aggression. In D. J. Pepler, K. C. Madsen, C. Webster & K. S. Levene (Eds.), *The development and treatment of girlhood aggression* (pp. 161-165). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- von Salisch, M. (2001). Children's emotional development: Challenges in their relationships to parents, peers, and friends. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25, 310-319.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *The collected works of LS Vygotsky: Volume 1: Problems of general psychology, including the volume Thinking and Speech* (Vol. 1). Springer.
- Walker, L. J. (1999). The perceived personality of moral exemplars. *Journal of Moral Education*, 28, 145-162.

- Walker, L. J. (2004). Gus in the gap: Bridging the judgment-action gap in moral functioning. In D. K. Lapsley & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Moral development, self, and identity* (pp. 1-20). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Walker, L. J., & Frimer, J. A. (2007). Moral personality of brave and caring exemplars. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(5), 845-860.
- Whitney, I., & Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 35, 3-25.
- Williams, C., & Bybee, J. (1994). What do children feel guilty about? Developmental and gender differences. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(5), 617-623.
- Wiseman, R. (2003). *Queen bees & wannabees: Helping your daughter survive cliques, gossip, boyfriends & other realities of adolescence*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Wong, D. B. (2009). Pluralism and moral identity. In D. Narvaez & D. K. Lapsley (Eds.), *Moral personality, identity, and character: An interdisciplinary future*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Xie, H. S., Dylan, C., Beverly, D., & Cairns, R. B. (2002). Aggressive behaviors in social interaction and developmental adaptation: A narrative analysis of interpersonal conflicts during early adolescence. *Social Development*, 11, 205-224.
- Young, E. L., Boye, A. E., & Nelson, D. A. (2006). Relational aggression: Understanding, identifying, and responding in schools. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43(3), 297-312.
- Zahn-Wexler, C., Klimes-Dougan, B., & Slattery, M. J. (2000). Internalizing problems of childhood and adolescence: Prospects, pitfalls, and progress in understanding the development of anxiety and depression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 443-466.
- Zajonc, R. B. (1980). Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences. *American psychologist*, 35(2), 151.
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Pronk, R. E., Goodwin, B., Mastro, S., & Crick, N. R. (2013). Connected and isolated victims of relational aggression: associations with peer group status and differences between girls and boys. *Sex roles*, 1-15.



## APPENDIX A

Interview questions for analysis (adapted from Schrader, 2005)

How have you changed since last year?

### **Identity:**

How would you describe who you really are?

What adjectives would you use?

Who are you when you are with your friends? Do you think you change somehow? (Why or what do you think causes you to change?)

How would your friends describe you?

How do you feel about yourself as a person?

Which matters more: how you feel about yourself or how your friends feel about you? Do you exist apart from having friends? How do you exist apart from your group?

### **Emotional Resilience:**

How do you make yourself feel better after someone has been mean to you?

What do you do to “get over it”? Do you ever truly “get over” that experience?

Do you think that being mean might be more harmful to some people than it is for others? For example, do you think that some people might never “get over” someone else being mean to them? Why/why not?

Do you think that “getting over” an experience would change how you would react in a similar situation?

### **Emotional Reflection:**

Think about a situation when you were really angry with another girl who is your friend.

Tell me about that situation. What did you do?

Did you think about what you were going to do, or did you just do it?

Do you ever reflect or think about your feelings while you are experiencing them, or do you only do it afterwards?

Have you ever thought about WHY you are feeling an emotion before you react to it?

If so, does that change the way that you react to the situation?

Do you think that reflecting on your emotions would help you to make better decisions? How do you think someone could help you learn how to do that?

Do you know of anyone who is angry with someone who acted in a way that you would hope people would act if they were angry with you?

### **Self questions** (adapted from Kegan, 1982):

Tell me about a situation in your life where you felt torn with other girls.

What did you value most (think was most important to you personally) in that situation?  
What was your role in the situation? What did you do?  
What got in the way of, or competed with, doing what you thought was right or best, or what you valued most? Was it some kind of “threat” to who you are? Tell me about that.  
Is there anything that you would do differently? Why or why not?  
What would you change about the situation, what you did, or how you reacted?  
What/why?

**Real Life Dilemma** (adapted from Gilligan, 1982):

Describe a situation of girls being mean to each other that you know about.  
What was the situation? How did you become aware of it?  
Was there a conflict for you? What was it?  
Was there something that you could see as being right or wrong to do in that situation?  
What was it?  
What kinds of things did you think about in dealing with the situation?  
What were the most important things to consider in deciding what to do? How did you know?  
What did you do? Why?

Now that you think back on the situation, were you aware of a strategy or some approach you were using to solve it? What was it?  
Did you consider that strategy to be the best one to use? How did you know it was?  
Did you consider alternative ways of thinking? (If so), how did you choose the one you chose?  
How did you know when you reached a solution? Was that the best solution? How did you know?  
Thinking back over the situation again and how you thought about it at the time, were you aware of your thinking about your decision process at that time, or are you able to construct what you thought about as we've been talking about it?  
Has this interview affected your thinking in any way?

**Bystander Role:**

Have you ever been in a situation where you have seen someone be treated with disrespect, where someone tried to take them away from their friends, excluded them, talked behind their back, or things like that and you just stood by and let it happen?

- What happened?
- What were you thinking at the time?
- Did you define this as bullying or aggression?
- Did you see yourself as a person who was just standing by or witnessing it; not involved?
- How did you feel?

- What did you do?
- What did you WANT to do?
- What kept you from doing that? What was at risk for you?
- What should you have done? Why? (The moral language of “should” rather than “might or could” is intentional—not to make the girls feel bad, but to get them to think about what their moral obligations might be. This will be explained to the girls if they look uncomfortable with the “should” word.)
- Do you think that someone else should have done something? Who?
- What should someone else have done? Why?
- Why didn’t they? What kept them from doing that?
- Looking back over the situation, what would you do differently? Why?
- What do you think happened to the target of this behavior?
- Did what happened change the way you act with your friends? When you see something like this happen again? Why/how?
- What would you hope people would do if you were the target of these behaviors? Why should they do that? What would get in the way of them doing that?
- What would you hope people would do if you were the aggressor in this situation? Why should they do that? What would get in the way of their doing that?
- How aware were you of your thinking in that situation, while you were in it? Do you think that made a difference/would make a difference?

## **RELATIONAL AGGRESSION INTERVIEW (RAI)**

I’m going to read aloud a situation of relational aggression. I would like to know how you might think about this dilemma. (Note to interviewers: use your judgment about the flow of the conversation in asking the questions. Make sure they are all asked, but the order and wording may differ slightly depending on interviewee.)

Cassie was the leader of the group, always being the one who organized the other girls for things to do. Dixie, Alana and Karen were friends too, sitting together at the lunchroom table every day. One day at lunch, Cassie said that they would all go to the movies together on Saturday afternoon. That afternoon Cassie told Dixie and Alana that she didn’t really want Karen to come to the movie even though she was in the group when they all decided to go, and if they didn’t agree with her, then that person could just not come, too. Dixie agreed and said she didn’t think Karen fit in the group because of the clothes she wears, and Alana was silent because she was torn—she wanted to go with the girls but didn’t want to hurt Karen’s feelings. So, Cassie told Dixie to call Karen on the phone that night and say that all the girls’ weren’t allowed to go to the movies. Cassie listened in on the conversation. Karen was disappointed, but was devastated when she went to the movie anyway with her family, and saw all the girls there together. To make matters worse, Cassie, Dixie and Alana were whispering about Karen behind her back, rolling their eyes at her, and then Cassie finally came over and said, “We hope you don’t have hurt feelings, but we just wanted to go with our *BEST* friends. At the end of the movie, the three girls talked loudly so

Karen could hear about how they were all going to have a sleep-over party later that evening.

**Part A:**

What gets in the way of standing up for yourself or standing up for other people against someone who is being mean?

**Moral emotions**

How do you think Cassie, Alana, Dixie, and Karen each felt in this situation?

How would you feel in this situation?

Would your feelings change depending on what you did in this situation? How would they change and why?

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Year 3 Interview Protocol (adapted from Schrader, 2005)**

These questions are guidelines for the interviewer to use to understand the way the participants think and will not necessarily be asked in these words or the exact order (except in the MJI). The language may be adapted depending on the age level of the person.

#### **Interview 1**

How have you changed since last year?  
How have your friends changed (as individuals, not who your friends are)?  
How has your friendship group changed?  
How is school for you (academically and socially)?

#### **Identity:**

How would you describe who you really are?  
What adjectives would you use?  
Who are you when you are with your friends? Do you think you change somehow? (Why or what do you think causes you to change?)  
How would your friends describe you?  
How do you feel about yourself as a person?

#### **Popularity:**

What kinds of groups are there at school?  
Is any one better than another? Which ones? Why?  
Are you in the popular group at school? What group are you in? How do you know?  
Is there one person who is most popular? (Is it you?)? What characteristics does she have?  
Do you want to be like her? (Follow up all with asking to explain)

Which matters more: how you feel about yourself or how your friends feel about you?  
Do you exist apart from having friends? How do you exist apart from your group?

#### **Moral Leadership and Integrity:**

Think about a time when you thought of yourself as standing strong for what you thought was right, for being who you really are, even though your friends might disagree with you or make fun of you or otherwise try to make you change who you are or what you think is right.

What was the situation?  
Can you describe what you were thinking and feeling at the time?  
Did you ever feel like there was a threat to who you are, or did you feel like you would lose a part of yourself if you complied with your friends and didn't do what YOU thought was the right thing?

How did you feel when you were doing it? How do you feel now?  
Have there been positive/negative consequences from your actions?  
Would you do what you did again?  
Would you encourage other people to do what you did? How could you encourage them?  
How could someone else (teacher, parent, etc.) help them to do that?  
Do you think that if other girls stayed strong about whom they are, things would be better somehow? If yes, in what way? If no, why would/should a girl change who she is in order to be like her friends?

Do you think that if enough people stood up for each other and really cared about each other that the environment of your school would change? Do you think it would change to be better or worse?

**Emotional Resilience:**

How do you make yourself feel better after someone has been mean to you?  
What do you do to “get over it”? Do you ever truly “get over” that experience?  
Do you think that being mean might be more harmful to some people than it is for others? For example, do you think that some people might never “get over” someone else being mean to them? Why/why not?  
Do you think that “getting over” an experience would change how you would react in a similar situation?

**Emotional Reflection:**

Think about a situation when you were really angry with another girl who is your friend.  
Tell me about that situation. What did you do?  
Did you think about what you were going to do, or did you just do it?  
Do you ever reflect or think about your feelings while you are experiencing them, or do you only do it afterwards?  
Have you ever thought about WHY you are feeling an emotion before you react to it?  
If so, does that change the way that you react to the situation?  
Do you think that reflecting on your emotions would help you to make better decisions? How do you think someone could help you learn how to do that?

Do you know of anyone who is angry with someone who acted in a way that you would hope people would act if they were angry with you?

**Environmental Influences:**

Do you think that the environment of the school affects how people treat each other? In a positive way or in a negative way?  
Do you think that what you learn at home from your parents/siblings/other family members affects how you treat people? In what way?  
Do you think what other people learn at home affects how they treat people?  
Do you change who you are in any way because of other people?

## **Interview 2**

**Moral atmosphere:** Now I would like to talk to you about your ideas about your school.

How would you describe the social atmosphere of your school?

(Prompt: Is there respect for one another, caring, support, and acceptance of differences?)

Do you feel safe emotionally and physically at school?

What helps make you feel safe?

How do you feel when you see an incident of relational aggression/girls being mean to each other? What does it make you want to do? What do you wish you and/or others would do?

What would be your idea of an ideal school atmosphere/culture/environment? What would interfere with that?

What would be your idea of an ideal relational atmosphere/culture/environment?

**Self questions** (adapted from Kegan, 1982):

Tell me about a situation in your life where you felt torn with other girls.

What did you value most (think was most important to you personally) in that situation?

What was your role in the situation? What did you do?

What got in the way of, or competed with, doing what you thought was right or best, or what you valued most? Was it some kind of “threat” to who you are? Tell me about that.

Is there anything that you would do differently? Why or why not?

What would you change about the situation, what you did, or how you reacted?

What/why?

**Real Life Dilemma** (adapted from Gilligan, 1982):

Describe a situation of girls being mean to each other that you know about.

What was the situation? How did you become aware of it?

Was there a conflict for you? What was it?

Was there something that you could see as being right or wrong to do in that situation? What was it?

What kinds of things did you think about in dealing with the situation?

What were the most important things to consider in deciding what to do? How did you know?

What did you do? Why?

Now that you think back on the situation, were you aware of a strategy or some approach you were using to solve it? What was it?

Did you consider that strategy to be the best one to use? How did you know it was?

Did you consider alternative ways of thinking? (If so), how did you choose the one you chose?

How did you know when you reached a solution? Was that the best solution? How did you know?

Thinking back over the situation again and how you thought about it at the time, were you aware of your thinking about your decision process at that time, or are you able to construct what you thought about as we've been talking about it?

Has this interview affected your thinking in any way?

### **Part B:**

I would like to ask you about different roles that people have identified in situations where there is aggression among girls. In school, girls have been in one or all of these roles, and I would like us to talk about each one and how you experienced them. (If the time is short, I will ask only about Bystander Roles) [Note: all these questions may not be asked in turn, but they will be used to guide the interview]

### **Bystander Role:**

Have you ever been in a situation where you have seen someone be treated with disrespect, where someone tried to take them away from their friends, excluded them, talked behind their back, or things like that and you just stood by and let it happen?

- What happened?
- What were you thinking at the time?
- Did you define this as bullying or aggression?
- Did you see yourself as a person who was just standing by or witnessing it; not involved?
- How did you feel?
- What did you do?
- What did you WANT to do?
- What kept you from doing that? What was at risk for you?
- What should you have done? Why? (The moral language of “should” rather than “might or could” is intentional—not to make the girls feel bad, but to get them to think about what their moral obligations might be. This will be explained to the girls if they look uncomfortable with the “should” word.)
- Do you think that someone else should have done something? Who?
- What should someone else have done? Why?
- Why didn't they? What kept them from doing that?
- Looking back over the situation, what would you do differently? Why?
- What do you think happened to the target of this behavior?
- Did what happened change the way you act with your friends? When you see something like this happen again? Why/how?
- What would you hope people would do if you were the target of these behaviors? Why should they do that? What would get in the way of them



- doing that?
- What would you hope people would do if you were the aggressor in this situation? Why should they do that? What would get in the way of their doing that?
- How aware were you of your thinking in that situation, while you were in it? Do you think that made a difference/would make a difference?

### **Interview 3**

#### **Before the interview, ask:**

Was there anything that you wanted to say in the last interview you thought about later and wanted to add?

#### **Moral Judgment and Moral Metacognition**

Dilemma II Form B (Colby and Kohlberg, 1987) from the Moral Judgment Interview (MJJ)

(This dilemma was selected for this study since it has to do with girls, promise keeping, a close relationship such as sisters might have, and authority—issues that may be most related to relational aggression)

Judy was a 12 year old girl. Her mother promised her that she could go to a special rock concert coming to their town if she saved up from babysitting and lunch money so she would have enough money to buy a ticket to the concert. She managed to save up enough money for the ticket plus another \$20. But then her mother changed her mind and told Judy that she had to spend the money for new clothes for school. Judy was disappointed and decided to go to the concert anyway. She bought a ticket and told her mother that she had only been able to save \$20. That Saturday she went to the performance and told her mother that she was spending the day with a friend. A week passed without her mother finding out. Then Judy told her older sister Louise, that she had gone to the performance and had lied to her mother about it. Louise wonders whether to tell their mother what Judy did.

1. Should Louise tell their mother that Judy had lied about the money or should she keep quiet? Why or why not?
2. In wondering whether or not to tell, Louise thinks of the fact that Judy is her sister. Should that make a difference in Louise's decision? Why/why not?
3. Does telling have anything to do with being a good daughter? Why/why not? A good sister? Why/why not?
4. Is the fact that she earned the money herself important in this situation?
5. Is the fact that the mother promised she could go to the concert if she earned the money the most important thing in this situation? Why/why not?
6. Why, in general, should promises be kept?
7. Is it important to keep a promise to someone that you don't know well and might never see again? Why/why not?

8. What is the most important thing a mother should be concerned about in relation to her daughter? Why is that most important?
9. What is the most important thing a sister should be concerned about in relation to her sister?
10. In general, what should be the authority of a mother over her daughter? Why?
11. What is the most important thing a daughter should be concerned about in relation to her mother? Why is that the most important thing?
12. What would you say is the most responsible thing for Louise to do in this situation?

**Metacognitive Interview** (adapted from Schrader, 1988):

- 1) Thinking back over the dilemma I just read about Judy and Louise, how did you know how to answer or think about it?
- 2) What did you consider in deciding how to solve it?
- 3) How did you know what to consider, and what were the best things to consider?
- 4) Were you aware of a strategy or some approach or way of thinking that you were using to solve the dilemma? What was it?
- 5) Did you consider that strategy/approach/way of thinking to be the best one to use in order to solve the dilemma? How did you know it was the best?
- 6) Did you consider alternate strategies or ways of thinking? If so, how did you choose the one you chose?
- 6b) Do you think other people have different strategies or ways of thinking? What do you think they are? How valid are they (or in other words, are they just as good as the one you used)?
- 7) How did you know when the dilemma was resolved or when you reached an adequate solution?
- 8) Thinking back over the dilemma and your ways of solving it, would you change your approach to the problem or your answers? Why?
- 9) Were you aware of your thinking processes while you were solving the dilemma earlier, or were you able to reconstruct your process just because of this interview?

**Aggressor Role:**

Have you ever been in a situation where you treated someone with disrespect, tried to take away their friends, excluded them, talked behind their back or things like that?

- What happened?
- What were you thinking at the time?
- Did you define this as bullying or aggression?
- Did you see yourself as aggressive at the time?
- How did you feel at the time?
- What did you do?
- What did you WANT to do?
- What kept you from doing that? What was at risk for you?
- What should you have done? Why?
- What should someone else have done? Why? Why didn't they/What kept them from doing that?
- Looking back over the situation, what would you do differently? Why?
- What do you think happened to the target of this behavior?
- Did what happened change the way you act with your friends?
- Did it change anything you do when you see something like this happen again? Why/how?
- What would you hope people would do if you were doing these behaviors again? Why should they do that? What would get in the way of them doing that?
- How aware were you of your thinking in that situation, while you were in it? Do you think that made a difference/would make a difference?

#### **Interview 4**

#### **RELATIONAL AGGRESSION INTERVIEW (RAI)**

I'm going to read aloud a situation of relational aggression. I would like to know how you might think about this dilemma. (Note to interviewers: use your judgment about the flow of the conversation in asking the questions. Make sure they are all asked, but the order and wording may differ slightly depending on interviewee.)

Cassie was the leader of the group, always being the one who organized the other girls for things to do. Dixie, Alana and Karen were friends too, sitting together at the lunchroom table every day. One day at lunch, Cassie said that they would all go to the movies together on Saturday afternoon. That afternoon Cassie told Dixie and Alana that she didn't really want Karen to come to the movie even though she was in the group when they all decided to go, and if they didn't agree with her, then that person could just not come, too. Dixie agreed and said she didn't think Karen fit in the group because of the clothes she wears, and Alana was silent because she was torn—she wanted to go with the girls but didn't want to hurt Karen's feelings. So, Cassie told Dixie to call Karen on the phone that night and say that all the girls' weren't allowed to go to the movies. Cassie listened in on the conversation. Karen was disappointed, but was devastated when she went to the movie anyway with her family, and saw all the girls there together. To make matters worse, Cassie, Dixie and Alana were whispering about Karen behind her back, rolling their eyes at her, and then Cassie

finally came over and said, “We hope you don’t have hurt feelings, but we just wanted to go with our *BEST* friends. At the end of the movie, the three girls talked loudly so Karen could hear about how they were all going to have a sleep-over party later that evening.

**Part A:**

Do you think this is relational aggression? Why/why not?

What should have and could have been done differently here? Why?

What were the right things to do here? What were the wrong things?

What risks are involved (what is at stake) for Dixie and Alana if they tried to include Karen? What would get in the way of Alana speaking up to include Karen?

What should Karen do?

What would get in the way of Karen standing up to her friends and telling them that they were being mean?

Who was the bully? Who was the victim? Who was in the position to do something good? Why should they?

How/why do you think that Karen could be strong enough to stand up to her friends in this situation? Could you see yourself doing that? Why/why not? What gets in the way of standing up for yourself or standing up for other people against someone who is being mean?

**Moral emotions**

How do you think Cassie, Alana, Dixie, and Karen each felt in this situation?

How would you feel in this situation?

Would your feelings change depending on what you did in this situation? How would they change and why?

**The story continues:**

The next day, Karen called Dixie and Alana and told them that Cassie had been talking behind their backs in school and saying that Alana was just a wannabe and that Dixie was a slut. Dixie and Alana were very angry, and that Monday in school, both Dixie and Alana ignored Cassie and sat with Karen at the lunch table. Karen, Dixie, and Alana also started spreading Cassie’s secrets around the school and making up rumors about her.

**Follow-up questions:**

- Did Karen do the right thing? Should Karen and the other girls do this? Why/why not?
- Did Dixie and Alana do the right thing? Why/why not? Were they being good friends?
- How would you feel if your friends did this to you? What would you do about it?
- Why would the girls react like this?
- What might make Karen think that this is a good way to handle the situation? Do you think it is a good way to handle the situation?

- What else could Karen do?
- What is the moral thing to do? (What does moral mean to you?)
- Is (using girl's definition of moral qualities) important to you? Does it define who you are? Why?
- How could any of the girls be moral leaders in this situation?
- What would get in the way of being a moral leader?

Now think about your reaction to the situation.

What should the girls do? Pick the solution from the following options that best describes how you think:

- a) Since Cassie was so mean to all of them, it is ok for Karen, Dixie and Alana to not let Cassie sit with them, and to talk about her. She deserved it for what she did.
- b) The girls should all keep quiet and just forget about it. Things will blow over eventually, and staying friends is the most important part of the situation. You wouldn't want to lose your friends, even if they did say mean things about you or excluded you. Everyone does that from time to time.
- c) Friendship involves working out problems and talking out the differences. Without working out problems you can't stay friends, and having friends is what makes school run smoothly and let's everyone hang out together and learn from each other. They should stay calm and try to get to the root of the conflict and agree that it does not happen again.

### **Victim role:**

Have you ever been in a situation where someone has treated you with disrespect, tried to take you away from your friends or them away from you, excluded you, talked behind you back or things like that?

- What happened?
- What were you thinking at the time?
- Did you define this as bullying or aggression?
- How did you feel?
- What did you do?
- What did you WANT to do?
- What kept you from doing that? What was at risk for you?
- What should you have done? Why?
- What should someone else have done? Why? Why didn't they/What kept them from doing that?
- Looking back over the situation, what would you do differently? Why?
- Why do you suppose that happened to you?
- What will you do to avoid that happening to you again?
- How aware were you of your thinking in that situation, while you were in it? Do you think that made a difference/would make a difference?

That's all. Do you have anything to add, or want to talk about anything we haven't discussed?

Thanks. Are you willing to let us contact you again next year?

## APPENDIX C

### Coding Manual

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

The coding manual is organized into the following sections: Emotions, Emotional Awareness, Action, and Motivations for (not) Getting Involved. When working through the construction cases, I suggest that you go through looking for each category separately (emotions, then emotional processes, then action, then motivations for getting involved/not getting involved). Reading the data several times may seem repetitive, but it allows you to become familiar with what is going on and to better understand the context in which girls are living.

Each chunk of data can be coded for multiple things. In the case of anger, guilt, and emotional monitoring codes, it's important to consider which sub-code makes sense. For example, anger as a moral emotion is relatively rare in the data (anger in a moral sense); anger as an offensive reaction occurs much more often. Also, when a girl is speaking about "feeling bad," you need to pay special attention to the context. If she is a bystander/bully, she is speaking about feeling guilty, and depending on her justification, you should code that as guilt of some variety. If she is a victim, she is probably speaking about "feeling bad" because she is isolated from the group or victimized, and thus should be coded as "feel bad/feel sad."

Please pay attention to some of the special notes. For example, girls frequently say that they feel "embarrassed" when really they feel shame. You need to pay attention to the context and how girls are speaking about things.

Please do NOT code for jealous or awkward.

## LIST OF CODES

### **EMOTIONS**

Moral Anger  
Anger  
Anger as a reaction—offensive  
Anger as a reaction—defensive  
Anger as a consequence  
Anger leads to isolation from the social group  
Reflection on anger within the social group  
Anger as paralyzing  
Anger as a catalyst  
Contempt  
Shame  
Embarrassment  
Guilt  
Guilt as a catalyst to act  
Guilt consequence  
Guilt external  
Guilt internal  
Guilt transition torn  
Guilt undefined  
Compassion  
Positive upstanding emotion  
Feel bad/Feel sad  
Disappointed  
Awkward  
Jealous  
Disgust  
Gratitude

### **MOTIVATIONS FOR INVOLVEMENT**

Absolve self of responsibility  
Maintain friendships  
Not fair  
Power (lack of compassion for others)  
Strong sense of self  
Torn between self and others  
Victim deserves it

### **EMOTIONAL AWARENESS**

Monitoring  
Paralyzing  
Reflection  
Self-control  
Emotional downregulation

### **ACTION**

Confront  
Disengage  
Engage in another behavior  
Forget  
Forgive  
Ignore  
Isolate  
Redirect group  
Upstand  
Upstand to maintain friendship  
Perspective taking  
Groupthink



MORAL EMOTIONS (Those emotions designated as originating from Haidt's 2003 work come from that article. Others emerged from the data analysis, including the anger and guilt subcategories)

EMOTION	DEFINITION	EXAMPLE
<p>Moral Anger (Haidt, 2003)</p> <p>Violations of rights and fairness</p>	<p>Elicitor: "unjustified insults, triggered on behalf of one's friends, as well as oneself (p. 856)"</p> <p>Action: "a motivation to attack, humiliate, or otherwise get back at the person who is perceived as acting unfairly or immorally (p. 856)"</p> <p>Moral when this motivation is felt in third-party situations (self not involved)</p>	<p><i>Participant 14 Y3: I was feeling sort of angry because I knew she was a good friend and I didn't think they should be treating her that way.</i></p>
Anger	When participants speak about being "mad" or "angry" generally	<p>Participant 12 Y1: Because it got everyone to a point where everyone was satisfied. Everyone might have been a little mad, but mostly everyone was good.</p>
Anger as a reaction--offensive	Lashing out at another person (like when someone is being mean)	<p>Participant 2 Year 1: S: Because I think that if the daughter had problems at school she might take the mad at people out at home and be mad at her mother, too.</p>
Anger as a reaction--defensive	Escape anger as a reaction	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: When two of my good friends, when they argue I feel really torn or when I feel one friend gossiping about another it</p>

		makes me feel really torn. I want to stop them but they might get mad at me...
Anger as a consequence	Your actions might cause someone to get mad at you	<p>Participant 2 Year 1: S: If someone's mad at you, other girls like your friends might get on their side and then they'd be mad at you too and you wouldn't have any friends.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1...like maybe the PD might be friends with the bully and the target and they don't want to get one of the mad.</i></p>
Anger leads to isolation from the social group	Either your own anger or someone else's forces you out of the group	Participant 5 Year 1: S: Then they'd both get angry at you. It might make them feel better because they're working as a team to single you out. Makes you feel terrible.
Reflection on anger within the social group	Thinking about how anger affects the group as a whole	Participant 5 Year 1: S: Yeah because when you're kind of angry at a friend, a group of friends can make it so it's not really hard on either friend.

		<p><i>Participant 6 Year 1: R: Um because I think I have had experience with that and I know it is really a messy situation and I wouldn't want it to happen again because it can really hurt people's feelings and get people angry and make disagreements about things.</i></p>
Anger as paralyzing	When anger within the group makes you unsure what to do so you do not act	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: Once in art class two of my friends... one of them said something that obviously annoyed the other friend and one friend said, "don't do it!" kind of loud in an annoyed voice and the friend said she was yelling at her and she got really mad and was like "you don't have to yell at me. I'm just doing what I do." And she walked off in a huff. IT was not good. I did not know what to do because they're both my really good friends.</p>
Anger as a catalyst	Anger pushes you to act, to reflect, to change, to take another person's perspective	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: Oftentimes there are</p>

		arguments over little things and someone will get really mad and stomp away and people will talk behind their back. That happens a lot.
<p>Contempt (Haidt, 2003)</p> <p>Violations of duty</p>	<p>Elicitor: “looking down on someone and feeling morally superior...In hierarchical societies, contempt toward those beneath the self is a kind of cool indifference, a statement that the other is not even worthy of strong feelings such as anger (p. 858)”</p> <p>Action: “it seems to cause social-cognitive changes such that the object of contempt will be treated with less warmth, respect, and consideration in future interactions...it therefore weakens other moral emotions, such as compassion (p. 858)”</p>	<p>Participant 2 Year 2: Well Cassie probably felt that she was doing something a little bit wrong but she didn't really care because she doesn't like Karen after all...</p> <p><i>Participant 3 Year 2: Dealing with somebody <b>seems</b> like you're just taking out the trash. Being really horrible and like kicking them out. I don't know exactly where just kicking them out.</i></p> <p><b>NOTE: This quote can also be coded as Isolate</b></p> <p><i>Participant 16 Year 2: I thought about how my friends talked and how awful they were.</i></p>
<p>Shame (Haidt, 2003)</p> <p>Always hurts because reflects on “true self”</p>	<p>Elicitor: “it then expands to take on broader issues about how one should be...shame is said to be a painful emotion</p>	<p>Participant 2 Year 2: S: Well it would be kind of embarrassing for</p>

<p><b>NOTE: Girls never speak about shame (using that emotion word) but they do talk about embarrassment. When girls speak about embarrassment, they speak about it in a way that matches Haidt's (2003) definition of shame. I have coded these as shame AND embarrassment, but I think the codes could be combined into one (either "shame-embarrassment" or "shame").</b></p>	<p>that results from actions that reveal the self to be flawed or defective (p. 860)”  “shame is elicited by the appraisal that there is something wrong or defective with one’s core self, generally due to a failure to measure up to standards of morality, aesthetics, or competence (p. 860)”</p> <p>Action: “They both lead people to reduce their social presence, creating a motivation to hide, withdraw, or disappear, and making movement and speech more difficult and less likely (p. 860)”  “shame involves a darker and more painful urge to withdraw, which can even motivate suicide (p. 860)”</p>	<p>that person if they weren’t friends or if they didn't know those people to go up and say even though I don’t know you I’m just coming up to say this, that you shouldn’t be teasing that girl.</p> <p><i>Participant 9 Year 1: S: It’s actually very, very different cause with my friends, I fight, but it’s not about like personal stuff, uhm, with my sister, I don’t know, I think I’m a lot closer with my sister because she does know me a lot better and she does treat me a lot more different, she doesn’t like care what anybody thinks when she’s talking to me cause uhm, no one else, it’s just like I’m not judging her, but when I’m talking to my friends I have to be like, uhm, I have to be very cautious about what I say or else it could get out or it could uhm it could be embarrassing or something that I</i></p>
--	---	--

		<i>think is not funny but they do, and that hurts a lot so you have to be careful what you say.</i>
Embarrassment (Haidt, 2003) Can be lighthearted because not as connected to the self	<p>Elicitor: “when one violates social conventions, whereas shame is more typically elicited by one’s own perceived violation of a moral norm (p. 860)”</p> <p>“by appraisals that one’s social identity or persona within an interaction is damaged or threatened, most commonly because one has violated a social-conventional rule but also at times because of events beyond one’s control (p. 860)”</p> <p>Action: “They both lead people to reduce their social presence, creating a motivation to hide, withdraw, or disappear, and making movement and speech more difficult and less likely (p. 860)”</p> <p><b>NOTE: In nonwestern cultures, shame and embarrassment can be very similar—independent versus interdependent self. In our data, girls evidence this interdependent self—they treat shame and embarrassment as the same thing. May want to collapse these emotions together</b></p>	<p><i>Participant 8 Year 1: S: Not the accidentally purpose, but probably all the others and then it gets into a thing where you feel like you just don’t want to come to school because everybody is going to make fun of you, or something like that. And like, I had a friend where they accidentally, a boy accidentally kissed her and he was a really kind of weird boy and she didn’t come to school the next day and I called her and I said, “why did you not come to school today?” and she said that she was afraid that people would make fun of her because of that, so she didn’t come to school that day. So, I’ve been teased and stuff like that, but I have to come to school and just face it, but then usually</i></p>

		<i>something embarrassing happens in a few minutes or hours, so they kind of get over it and start, you know, with another thing.</i>
<p>Guilt (Haidt, 2003)</p> <p>“Whereas the elicitors and displays of shame clearly link it to hierarchical interactions, the elicitors and action tendencies of guilt suggest that it grows out of communal relationships and the attachment system”</p> <p>“All three emotions are important moral emotions, because their action tendencies generally make people conform to rules and uphold the social order.”</p> <p>“Indeed, the complete lack of shame, embarrassment, and guilt is one of the most salient hallmarks of the psychopath, along with the absence of sympathy.”</p>	<p>Elicitor: “caused by the violation of moral rules and imperatives (p. 861)”  “occur overwhelmingly in the context of communal relationships in which one believes one has caused harm, loss, or distress to a relationship partner (p. 861)”  “triggered most powerfully if one’s harmful action also creates a threat to one’s communion with or relatedness to the victim (p. 861)”  “In guilt situations one appraises one’s action as bad, not one’s entire self (p. 861)”</p> <p>Action: “it motivates one to help one’s victim or otherwise to make up for one’s transgression (p. 861)”  “guilt motivates people to treat their relationship partners well (p. 861)”  “guilt motivates people to apologize and to confess, not as a way to debase themselves but as a way to restore or improve their relationships (p. 861)”</p>	<p>Participant 5 Year 2: S: I feel, if I don’t do anything about it, I feel partially guilty and maybe partially responsible because I didn’t stop it. But I also feel sadness for the girl and I also feel some kind of anger for the girl who was aggressive to the other girl. And I also kind of pity the girl who got, I feel bad for her.</p> <p><i>Participant 10 Year 1: S: Like if I were um, Alana, I would like, if I did something good with Karen I might feel better because I helped a friend, but if I did things with Cassie and Dixie like she did in the story, then I guess I would feel a little bit guilty about doing that.</i></p>
Guilt as a catalyst to act	You feel guilty so you act, either by standing up for the victim or consoling her after	Participant 2 Year 2: Because well even though that

	the fact	person they were talking about isn't going to find out, it just makes you feel bad inside that they're talking about that person. [clarifying why she would stand up for someone else]
Guilt consequence	You speak about guilt as a consequence	<i>Participant 10 Year 2: Well if I was Cassie and doing that I would probably feel bad about what I did to Karen because it was like really mean and she hurt her feelings and stuff.</i>
Guilt external	Feel guilty because of external pressures	<i>Participant 12 Year 1: S: Well I get guilted really easily, so I felt a little guilty after it so I guess that's why people do it behind people's back because its never as bad as if you say it to their face because you think they'll never know.</i>
Guilt internal	Feel guilty because of your conscience--you have let yourself down	<i>Participant 11 Year 1: S: Well I think, if you're never gonna see them again, then it's not very hard to um break the promise but you feel kinda guilty inside when you break the promise.</i>



Guilt transition torn	torn between the right and torn between the social group--Perry temporizing and you feel like you can't move	<p>Participant 13 Year 2: I: That's good. So let's see. So how do you feel when you see like some incident of relational aggression? How does that make you feel when you see what's going on? S: I sort of, I feel like I need to help. I feel a little guilty. I: Because you need to help but you don't want to?</p> <p><i>Participant 9 Year 1: Cassie probably wouldn't feel anything, she might feel a little guilt but probably not much. The other two probably felt like, "should we do something, or should we just stay by ourselves?"</i></p> <p><i>Participant 9 Year 2: ...And then Alana she probably felt really bad like what did she just do. And then but she kind of felt in the group...</i></p>
Guilt undefined	Guilt but not specified if it is external/internal. Also used when girls use the phrase "feel bad" when discussing guilty feelings.	<p><i>Participant 11 Year 1: S: Because, now that I look back on this, well I think that they were my</i></p>

		<i>friends, but they were being mean to me, so I think, I kinda feel even more satisfied now that they're not, cause, it was kind of nagging at me, for like a year, and I said, like, I feel kind of guilty that they weren't my friends anymore.</i>
<p>Compassion (Haidt, 2003)</p> <p>“being moved at another’s suffering”</p> <p>“deep feeling for and understanding of misery or suffering and the concomitant desire to promote its alleviation”</p> <p>The oldest of the moral emotions—DAAD is a part of this—feeling bad about someone's distress and motivated to help because of those feelings</p>	<p>Elicitor: “the perception of suffering or sorrow in another person (p. 862)”</p> <p>“compassion is most strongly and readily felt for one’s kin and for others with whom one has a close, communal relationship (p. 862)”</p> <p>Action: “Compassion makes people want to help, comfort, or otherwise alleviate the suffering of the other (p. 862)”</p> <p>“Compassion is linked to guilt conceptually and empirically. People who are more prone to feel other people’s pain are more prone to feel guilt but are less prone to feel shame (p. 862)”</p>	<p>Participant 2 Year 2: Because if Karen felt that everyone was on Cassie’s side and no one liked her then that would make her feel really bad, like it did. But at least if one person stood up for her she would have still felt like okay someone still likes me so maybe I can handle this.</p>
<p>Positive Upstanding Emotion [Awe and elevation (Haidt, 2003)]</p> <p>(I have called this positive upstanding emotion. As Haidt has discussed it, more like the numinous, but positive upstanding emotion seems like a weak version of this. JMM thinks of this as “the numinous”</p>	<p>Feeling good because you stood up for someone else</p> <p>Elicitor: “by a heterogeneous set of experiences, the largest of which are experiences of natural beauty, artistic beauty, and exemplary or exceptional human actions or abilities (p. 863)”</p> <p>“Elevation appears to be caused by seeing manifestations of</p>	<p>Participant 2 Year 1: S: Um, sometimes like I’m in a group of friends and when my group of friends stick up for each other, I feel happy and proud that we made somebody feel better.</p>

	<p>humanity's higher or better nature; it triggers a distinctive feeling in the chest of warmth and expansion; it causes a desire to become a better person oneself; and it seems to open one's heart, not only to the person who triggered the feeling but also to other people (p. 864)."</p> <p>"Acts of charity, kindness, loyalty, and self-sacrifice (p. 864)"</p> <p>Action: "seems to create a more generalized desire to become a better person oneself and to follow the example of a moral exemplar (p. 864)"</p> <p>"It opens people up to new possibilities for action and thought, making them more receptive to the lessons of a moral exemplar (p. 864)"</p>	
Feel bad/Feel sad	Feeling isolated or separated from the group. Tends to be what the victim feels, especially in hypothetical dilemma	Participant 2 Year 2: Oh Karen probably felt like everyone was siding against her since Alana didn't say anything.
Disappointed	When you are saddened by the actions of your friends	<i>Participant 9 Year 3: I was just really mad that they would ever say that. And I was just sort of disappointed that my friends would actually, I mean yeah people think that a lot but they can think whatever they want but I don't think they should say that in</i>

		<i>public. Especially to go around a group of like 12 girls because it's just really mean.</i>
Awkward	AUTOCODE: awkward	Do a search for awkward and code as Awkward
Jealous	AUTOCODE: Jealous. Girls tend to express jealousy around friends—who is friends with whom, what their friends are doing, etc.	Do a search for jealous* and code as Jealousy
Disgust (Haidt, 2003)  Violations of physical purity (religious norms)	Elicitor: “the guardian of the lower boundary of the category of humanity (p. 857)” Action: “motivation to avoid, expel, or otherwise break off contact with the offending entity, often coupled to a motivation to wash, purify, or otherwise remove residues of any physical contact that was made with the entity (p. 857)” “By ostracizing those who trigger moral disgust, people in society set up a reward-and-punishment structure that acts as a strong deterrent to culturally inappropriate behaviors (p. 858)”	NONE
Gratitude (Haidt, 2003)  “is a part of the emotional mechanism of reciprocal altruism, encouraging individuals to repay benefactors, just as anger motivates individuals to punish cheaters (p. 863)”  Positive emotions help people to “be here now” “Positive emotions encourage people to build social bonds, practice skills, and make	Elicitor: “the state of being grateful; warm and friendly feeling toward a benefactor prompting one to repay a favor (p. 863)” “triggered by the perception that another person has done a good deed for the self, intentionally and voluntarily (p. 863)” “functions as a moral barometer, sensitive to events in which another person provides benefits to the self, although they note that the	Participant 5 Year 1: I think it would because once they get through the argument they might look back and think; she did this for me to protect me. That's really nice.

improvements in themselves that may pay off in the future, when the environment becomes more demanding (p. 862)”	<p>feeling of gratitude is always pleasant (p. 863) ”</p> <p>Action: “functions as a moral motive in that it makes people act more prosocially although...not beyond direct benefactors (p. 863)”</p>	
--	---	--

EMOTIONAL AWARENESS (All of these codes emerged from the data)

Emotional awareness monitoring	Being aware of your own or others' emotions	Participant 2 Year 1: I Like the feeling we made someone happy?  <i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: It's kind of in your soul and in your heart. If it feels wrong you shouldn't do it.</i>	
Emotional awareness paralyzing	Awareness of emotions leads to an inability to act.	Participant 5 Year 1: S: Being able to tell Judy without her getting angry, which isn't possible. And being able to like, find a way to get Judy to tell her mom on her own which I don't think would be possible either unless Judy's willing. But I think that would make it better, but I don't know if it's possible unless I got to know Judy and Louise.	
Emotional awareness reflection	Reflecting on your emotions	Participant 2 Year 2: Well if I could change anything about the situation, I would have wished that it never had happened. But I, on my side, I was really glad that I could do something, that I felt like I really helped them.  <i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: I thought that if they are my friends, they'd really let me hang out with them no matter who they're hanging out with.</i>	
Emotional awareness self-control	Reflecting on emotions and changing your behavior. This can also be coded when you either do or don't get involved in a situation on behalf of someone else; you are	Participant 2 Year 1: S: I figured out it would be a plus if I backed away and it would be a plus and a minus if I got into the group... if it's a plus if I stayed in it because there would	

	controlling your emotions and impulses so you don't get involved in the fight.	be one more argue-er on our side. It would be a minus because then the group gets bigger and more arguing goes on, so I just backed off.  <i>Participant 8 Year 1: S: I said one thing about my friend probably because she was kind of being mean like if somebody is being mean to you, you probably want to like slap them in the face and crush them and stuff like that, but you have to realize that they are your friend, but you still have to do it...</i>	
Emotional downregulation	Calming the intensity of the emotion	Participant 5 Year 2: ...And I also tell myself that it's okay because it doesn't matter what they think of me, as long as I know that I'm okay.	

**ACTION (All these codes emerged from the data)**

Confront	When you directly speak to someone about their behavior.	Participant 5 Year 1: S: Sometimes people just have bad days and they argue and argue and argue and there's no way of stopping them unless you tell them to back off and take a breather. And, yeah.	
Disengage	When you walk away from the situation	Participant 2 Year 1: S: I think I could've done a little better talking to the girl and just letting her go in and figure it out but I just backed off.	
Engage in another behavior	When upset/sad, doing something else. This can be productive (talking to a friend, playing with dog) or unproductive (eating too much)	Participant 5 Year 2: I talk to my friends a lot and I'll tell them what happened and they make me feel better because they understand and they're caring....	
Forget	Claiming that you	Participant 15 Year 2:	

	forget the incident (also use the phrase "let it go," "move on," etc.	<p>Well a lot of my friends come to each other for advice on what to do and a lot of my friends talk to their parents about it. And I think our friends, our group, we really like to talk to each other about it and sometimes you just like to just forget about it and move on.</p> <p><i>Participant 9 Year 2:</i>  <i>No cause usually I think what they've done is wrong or it's the wrong opinion to think so I never do really like fully get over it but I think well I still want to be their friend so I have to forget about it.</i></p>	
Forgive	Forgiving someone. Typically coded only when the word is used, and coded even when girls are using a negative example to define forgiveness, or using the word forgive even when they aren't actually forgiving each other.	<p>Participant 15 Year 3:  Well at first I was like guys you just really need to forgive each other and then I got kind of annoyed at them and was like guys can you please make up and I just don't think I should have gotten that annoyed because they were both fighting.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 2:</i>  <i>There was a time where my friend, two of my friends were in fight because well they ended up, they were friends and then this other girl started being mean to them and they got so they were mad at her together. And then one of them forgave the other girl and the other girl didn't believe that they should have forgiven her. So they got mad at each other because she thought you're giving in too</i></p>	



		<p><i>easily and you do that a lot and you know they did something, they, they were mean to you and you shouldn't forgive them so easily because they'll just do it again and so I felt, I thought it was cool that my friend like forgave them and stuff because she was so like forgiving and she did that a lot. But then I looked, I thought it was true that my other friend, she said like, she was saying how you're giving in a lot and they did something mean to you and I thought that was true too. So I wasn't really sure whose side to be on and the problem with that, being friends with both of them they kind of expected you to pick one of their sides. So you start believing in one side and you're like yeah you're right and you start talking to them. And then you go the other person and they're like yeah I was just trying be nice and forgive them and stuff and maybe they won't do it again. And I'm like yeah you're right. And then they hear about I was just kind of trying to be neutral and they'll be like, then they'll end up getting like mad at me and I'll be like all I'm trying to do is stay friends with both of you and I shouldn't have to pick sides.</i></p>	
Ignore	You ignore the situation rather than get involved.	Participant 5 Year 2: S: Sometimes. Sometimes I might shy away a little bit because I don't	

		<p>want to have all my friends be angry at me. But sometimes I will.</p> <p><i>Participant 6 Year 2: It kind of makes me feel unsure of what to do sometimes and sometimes I know definitely what to do. And like sometimes I don't really know the people who are doing it so I may be just kind of simply not really getting into it and saying you know you shouldn't be doing that. But then with people who I know better, I kind of get more into it and try to stop it.</i></p>	
Isolate	To isolate someone from the group.	<p><i>Participant 3 Year 2: Dealing with somebody <b>seems</b> like you're just taking out the trash. Being really horrible and like kicking them out. I don't know exactly where just kicking them out.</i></p> <p><i>Participant 3 Year 2: I was trying to consider not hurting Josephine's feelings anymore but still keep Ala and Kalie happy and not feel like they're totally just being kicked out, like <b>be</b> socially flushed, I guess, you could say.</i></p>	
Redirect group	Wanting to get the group (occasionally getting the group) to do something else besides fight or victimize someone	<p>Participant 5 Year 2: I think I just kind of changed the participant and I was like well let's talk about this.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: I felt torn when me and my friends for the variety show, for the basketball team, we wanted to, we had sweaters, we were like</i></p>	

		<p><i>best friends, it was like a big a family that we had of our own. And when we got there people started fighting. It just kept going and going and people made each other cry and say, "why'd you have to do that?" And they'd start crying. And I felt really torn up and people started to leave. And I wished I had 8 arms to pull them all in and make them hug or something.</i></p>	
Upstand	When you stand up for someone else.	Participant 2 Year 1: I think everyone should stand up more for the girl who's being bullied. And maybe tell an adult and she would talk to the bully.	
Upstand in order to maintain the friendship (instrumental)	Stand up for someone with the explicit motive of keeping a friendship (not because it is the right thing to do)	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: Then you're a bystander and you know they're hurting each other and you're not doing anything about it. You have to do something about it because otherwise it can really create a rift in the friendship.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: Well even if your friends are being mean when they end up sad you should still make them feel better anyway.</i></p> <p><i>I: Why?</i>  <i>S: Because that's what's important. It doesn't matter if they were victim. They're your friends and that's your job kind of.</i></p>	
Perspective taking	Being able to look at the situation from multiple points of view.	Participant 15 Y3: Well there's been like, you kind of just have to put yourself in her shoes	

		and think well what would you want to have done to you when you're in that situation.	
Group think	Excusing bad behavior because beliefs are shared by the entire group	Participant 5 Year 2: Yes, I think that's very hard for some people and easier for some people. I mean some people in our school, even in our group, are very sensitive to what other people say, even if it's not mean it's just like a little constructive criticism. And so if somebody actually was trying to be mean and be very critical, I think they would take it very hard and I don't think they would deal with it.	

## MOTIVATIONS FOR (NOT) GETTING INVOLVED

Absolve self of responsibility	Take the perspective that you "cannot do anything about" the meanness for various reasons. Excuses the self for not getting involved.	<p>Participant 2 Year 1: S: IT sometimes makes... sometimes I don't really get to play a part in making that girl feel good when the bullies are in the way. I: Why not? S: Because they're bullying me and other people and I don't get a chance to do anything.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: It changes because in different situations I think, "it's not right or she's being mean or she deserves it, or maybe I should just back down I can't do anything about it."</i></p>	
Maintain friendships	Act in a way in order to keep friends; express concern about keeping friends. Keeping friendships is the most important thing.	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: two friends are turning on each other and they've always gotten along so well and they're really angry. It's not good to break up a relationship like that</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: If we stuck through it shows we really do need each other and we have each other and we got each others' backs and even through fights that stuff doesn't matter because we know we're friends.</i></p>	
Not fair	You believe something is not fair (generally coded when participant uses those words)	Participant 15 Year 2: S: I'm still kind of angry at it because she keeps on lying and lying and all the lying just builds and builds and builds and finally you know I just, you've got to burst, you've got to let it out somehow. And you know she tries	

		<p>to oh I never said that, I never said that. And she lies even more. And then if you try to talk to her she immediately starts crying and she brings in other things to the story like oh my best friend moved when I was in 1<sup>st</sup> grade and I haven't seen her in so long. And it's like we're not talking about that and she tries to get other people's attention. So I told my parents that and I went to like a therapist person and I told her about it and I was like it was just, it annoys me so much that I can't trust this friend and she lies and she gets attention. And it really helps.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 2:</i>  <i>There were times where people who signed it came back and said oh wait I changed my mind I don't want to sign it after they already signed in like pen. And I'll be like but you signed and you thought it was true and then it's not really kind of fair that you come back and change it and then there was a bunch of times where a bunch of people were like oh my gosh I can't believe who they think they are. But it all ended up good in the end.</i></p>	
Power (lack of compassion for others)	When a bully acts because she likes having power. Coded when the word is used but also coded implicitly.	<p>Participant 15 Year 2: I think Cassie didn't really care about what other people thought. I: Well how would you feel if you were Cassie? R: I guess I wouldn't really care either. Like</p>	

		I'd just be like really dominant and know that I have all that power.	
Strong sense of self	You can describe yourself and who you are. You have a sense of the qualities that make you unique. You will stand up to your friends because you are confident in who you are.	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: I want to stand up to my friends but it means I'd have to be two different people. But sometimes you just have to stand in the middle and tell them "don't do that." You have to be a block instead of a comforter.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: I thought that if they are my friends, they'd really let me hang out with them no matter who they're hanging out with.</i></p>	
Torn between self and others	I have been using this as torn between self and group and also for torn between the different parts of the group. Basically, if someone discusses feeling torn between groups, code it with this.	<p>Participant 5 Year 1: S: Once in art class two of my friends... one of them said something that obviously annoyed the other friend and one friend said, "don't do it!" kind of loud in an annoyed voice and the friend said she was yelling at her and she got really mad and was like "you don't have to yell at me. I'm just doing what I do." And she walked off in a huff. IT was not good. I did not know what to do because they're both my really good friends.</p> <p><i>Participant 4 Year 1: S: I was torn that those being mean were still sad and they were my friends and I couldn't let them down but those who were being victimized were sad, too. So I wished I could just stop it.</i></p>	
Victim deserves it	Victim deserves to be	<i>Participant 8 Year 3: I</i>	

<p><b>NOTE: It might be impossible to code this implicitly, but I think that this motivation tends to be an undercurrent to a lot of the justifications for bad behavior that happens.</b></p>	<p>bullied because of her own actions</p>	<p><i>don't think this year we've had such big fights. But I think last year we had several. I don't know, this girl as I said was being kind of annoying and everyone just started, this one girl started to not like her and she made everyone turn against her. So I think that was a really big fight last year because the girl didn't really do anything, but she just made everyone think she did.</i></p>	
--	---	---	--



---

<sup>i</sup> That being said, I think that in more sociopathic or violent girls, contempt may be a salient emotion to study. In our more typical sample, only one participant spoke of treating others like “trash” and how that treatment might make someone feel.

<sup>ii</sup> In order to calculate a precise interrater reliability co-efficient, primary documents within ATLAS.ti must be identical. When I began my coding, I used full versions of all interviews. In order to simplify the coding process for my undergraduate research assistant, I created a separate hermeneutical unit using modified those primary documents so that she only had portions of the interview that I was using for my analysis. Therefore, the two hermeneutic units could not be compared. Moreover, the code “moral anger” was developed in response to comparing the undergraduate rater’s codes to my own, and instances of “gratitude” were also included in the final analysis. The undergraduate rater did not code for “jealous” or “awkward” because those codes were only auto-coded, and she did not code for “disgust” because this code did not appear in the data.